

In this Issue :

Anarchist Ideas Today - p. 2

The Unwritten
Handbook - p. 3

Perennial Problems - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 26

June 28 1958

Threepence

SIR JOHN IS NOT SO TOUGH

Busmen go back with Concessions

THREE weeks ago Sir John Elliot, Chairman of London Transport made a statement on the bus strike to the effect that the attitude of the Executive would not change however long the bus strike continued. He said: "My attitude is a tough one. I feel that public opinion is behind it. I do not care for surrender—it does not attract me". This statement was made in conjunction with his decision to cut the bus services by 10% "whether the unions like it or not".

We suggested at the time that, for a variety of reasons, Sir John Elliot's 'tough' talk was partly bluff, a view which has been confirmed by the conditions which led to the end of the bus strike.

Last Wednesday, in spite of prophecies on all sides, the majority of garages voted to continue the strike because they were still dissatisfied with London Transport's promise to review the pay of the 14,000 men left out of the Industrial Court's award, and because of notices of cuts in services which had been posted in garages.

sum which "will closely approximate" the Central London crews increase, operative from July 2nd. In addition, he has withdrawn his threat that there will be an immediate cut on the bus services of 10%, but the 4% summer schedule reduction, fixed before the strike began, will stand. The Union has yielded on the demand for the 8/6d. to the Central Busmen to be back-dated to March 12th.

This is a victory for the strikers who held out for seven weeks, but there is no doubt that someone will have to pay the £2 million loss in London Transport receipts during the strike. Some form of fare increase is already planned, and it is unlikely that London Transport will be prepared to reduce its considerable profits.

Under our present economic system the problem of wage demands to meet rising costs in living is inevitable. Public transport is largely used by workers who have to foot the bill by paying higher fares. This, added to the soaring cost of food and other essentials, means that

result in the end is economic depression and unemployment. We may then have a 'local skirmish' or a full-scale war to solve national economic difficulties, after which the routine begins all over again. Only nowadays H-bombs are making the likelihood of survival after a war, enabling us to re-start our lunatic course over again, very remote. Some people think that annihilation would be better for mankind. They may be right. But, we prefer the rational and humane course, and suggest that we could begin tomorrow to organise society in such a way that the problems we have just touched on could be eliminated or, at least, reduced.

This would mean the abolition of money, the State and the means by which war can be waged. We already know the reactions to these suggestions from workers no less than their leaders. The worker who shows determination in a wages struggle cannot yet see the connection between his wage demands and all the other problems in society. Until he does, and is also prepared

Hungarian Executions

What Happens Next?

THE murder of Imre Nagy, Pal Malater and their two colleagues of the Hungarian uprising has, for once, revolted the Western world. Of itself the judicial execution of these men is an appalling crime, with its background of cold, calculated treachery, but it is also very much more. It is a clear indication of the Soviet Union's attitude towards Yugoslavia, and a grisly warning to the men in Poland who may now assume that Khrushchev has reconsidered his previous line and is now reverting to type—the Stalin type.

It is quite possible that Khrushchev always intended to return to the old policy of terror as soon as he had established himself firmly in power, and that his method of gaining security of tenure was by temporarily instigating a more liberal policy. Conversely it is possible that he is not as secure as appearances indicate, and has been forced to his present actions by the old Stalinists lining up against him.

Either way the outlook for peaceful co-existence has not improved. It cannot be supposed that the Soviet Government expected anything but censure from the West following upon the open admission of

in Communist countries.

One thing is certain; the U.S. and Britain are now in an even stronger position to disbelieve "suggestions for the furtherance of peaceful co-operation" which emanate from the Soviet Union. Since the Twentieth Congress it has been difficult for the West to accept as much world criticism as the Soviet Union on questions of genuineness of their desire for agreement on disarmament, nuclear tests and other matters. Now the West can point to a further example of distrust—and the United States may find it easier to talk its way out of a summit conference.

Meanwhile we must all await developments which will soon take place and will give us a clue as to the reason for Nagy's death, more important still, the reason for the publicity surrounding the killing. There are still at least three or four men who were in the last Nagy Coalition Government, who's fates are as yet undecided; a lot depends in all probability, upon the actions of Yugoslavia and Poland, but it may be that the Soviet Government no longer cares a hang for anyone's opinions—for the present—and

"Freedom is something substantial. A man who is ignorant is not free. A man who is a tramp is not free. A man who sees his wife and children starving is not free. A man who must toil twelve hours a day in order to vegetate is not free. A man who is full of cares is not free. A worker, whether labourer or capitalist, who, every day for certain hours, must be at the beck and call of a 'master' is not free."

—LAWRENCE GRONLUND

In this Issue :

Anarchist Ideas Today - p. 2

The Unwritten
Handbook - p. 3

Perennial Problems - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 26

June 28 1958

SIR JOHN IS NOT SO TOUGH

Busmen go back with Concessions

THREE weeks ago Sir John Elliot, Chairman of London Transport made a statement on the bus strike to the effect that the attitude of the Executive would not change however long the bus strike continued. He said: "My attitude is a tough one. I feel that public opinion is behind it. I do not care for surrender—it does not attract me". This statement was made in conjunction with his decision to cut the bus services by 10% "whether the unions like it or not".

We suggested at the time that, for a variety of reasons, Sir John Elliot's 'tough' talk was partly bluff, a view which has been confirmed by the conditions which led to the end of the bus strike.

Last Wednesday, in spite of prophecies on all sides, the majority of garages voted to continue the strike because they were still dissatisfied with London Transport's promise to review the pay of the 14,000 men left out of the Industrial Court's award, and because of notices of cuts in services which had been posted in garages.

By the next day Sir John had agreed to increase the wages of the 14,000 country bus workers by a

sum which "will closely approximate" the Central London crews increase, operative from July 2nd. In addition, he has withdrawn his threat that there will be an immediate cut on the bus services of 10%, but the 4% summer schedule reduction, fixed before the strike began, will stand. The Union has yielded on the demand for the 8/6d. to the Central Busmen to be back-dated to March 12th.

This is a victory for the strikers who held out for seven weeks, but there is no doubt that someone will have to pay the £2 million loss in London Transport receipts during the strike. Some form of fare increase is already planned, and it is unlikely that London Transport will be prepared to reduce its considerable profits.

Under our present economic system the problem of wage demands to meet rising costs in living is inevitable. Public transport is largely used by workers who have to foot the bill by paying higher fares. This, added to the soaring cost of food and other essentials, means that workers in other industries have to, in their turn, demand increases in wages. Prices continue to rise so that profits will still be made—the

result in the end is economic depression and unemployment. We may then have a 'local skirmish' or a full-scale war to solve national economic difficulties, after which the routine begins all over again. Only nowadays H-bombs are making the likelihood of survival after a war, enabling us to re-start our lunatic course over again, very remote. Some people think that annihilation would be better for mankind. They may be right. But, we prefer the rational and humane course, and suggest that we could begin tomorrow to organise society in such a way that the problems we have just touched on could be eliminated or, at least, reduced.

This would mean the abolition of money, the State and the means by which war can be waged. We already know the reactions to these suggestions from workers no less than their leaders. The worker who shows determination in a wages struggle cannot yet see the connection between his wage demands and all the other problems in society. Until he does, and is also prepared to take action to change the structure, then the whole crazy business must continue.

Hung

THE murder of Malater and leagues of the H has, for once, revolution world. Of itself tion of these men crime, with its bac calculated treacher very much more. cation of the Soviet towards Yugoslav warning to the me may now assume has reconsidered and is now revert Stalin type.

It is quite possi chev always inten the old policy of he had established power, and that his ing security of ten porarily instigating policy. Conversely he is not as secur indicate, and has b present actions by lining up against hi

Either way the ful co-existence ha It cannot be sup Soviet Government thing but censure fi lowing upon the o the Nagy killing; be assumed that what the reaction more interested in

CYPRUS

Britain Stays

AFTER shilly-shallying for years over policies for Cyprus while thousands of people died, or were injured, in a futile struggle for 'independence', the British Government now comes forward with a proposal which it is hoped will be acceptable to both Greek and Turkish Cypriots

It is impossible to say what the result of this plan will be until we hear more from Greece and Turkey. If accepted by each it is because they no longer consider it expedient to haggle with Britain over their respective claims: Turkish demands for partition and Greek proposals

ARKANSAS

A Backward S

LITTLE ROCK is in the news again, following on the decision by Federal Judge Harry Lemley that the Arkansas school board should be granted a delay of two-and-a-half years before having to continue with integration. This in effect reverses the ruling given last year by Judge

year of actively co Supreme Court's c gration with all d even though the State, with much su citizens, was atten a means of avoid falls to the grou

We suggested at the time that, for a variety of reasons, Sir John Elliot's 'tough' talk was partly bluff, a view which has been confirmed by the conditions which led to the end of the bus strike.

Last Wednesday, in spite of prophecies on all sides, the majority of garages voted to continue the strike because they were still dissatisfied with London Transport's promise to review the pay of the 14,000 men left out of the Industrial Court's award, and because of notices of cuts in services which had been posted in garages.

By the next day Sir John had agreed to increase the wages of the 14,000 country bus workers by a

who held out for seven weeks, but there is no doubt that someone will have to pay the £2 million loss in London Transport receipts during the strike. Some form of fare increase is already planned, and it is unlikely that London Transport will be prepared to reduce its considerable profits.

Under our present economic system the problem of wage demands to meet rising costs in living is inevitable. Public transport is largely used by workers who have to foot the bill by paying higher fares. This, added to the soaring cost of food and other essentials, means that workers in other industries have to, in their turn, demand increases in wages. Prices continue to rise so that profits will still be made—the

suggest that we could begin tomorrow to organise society in such a way that the problems we have just touched on could be eliminated or, at least, reduced.

This would mean the abolition of money, the State and the means by which war can be waged. We already know the reactions to these suggestions from workers no less than their leaders. The worker who shows determination in a wages struggle cannot yet see the connection between his wage demands and all the other problems in society. Until he does, and is also prepared to take action to change the structure, then the whole crazy business must continue.

It is quite possible that the old policy of he had established power, and that his ing security of temporarily instigating policy. Conversely he is not as secure indicate, and has present actions by lining up against him.

Either way the full co-existence has It cannot be Soviet Government thing but censure following upon the the Nagy killing; be assumed that what the reaction more interested in

CYPRUS

Britain Stays

AFTER shilly-shallying for years over policies for Cyprus while thousands of people died, or were injured, in a futile struggle for 'independence', the British Government now comes forward with a proposal which it is hoped will be acceptable to both Greek and Turkish Cypriots and which has been described by the *Observer* as "imaginative, fair and designed to meet the real interests of the Cypriot people".

The proposals, through a separate House of Representatives, are designed to give authority to Greek and Turkish Cypriots over communal and internal administration. The basic position of Britain however, remains unaltered, since responsibility for external affairs and internal security and defence is to rest with the Governor, in consultation with the Greek and Turkish Government representatives. The plan, it is suggested, should be given a seven years' trial period. So far, comments from Turkey and Greece have found the plan unacceptable, but, in the mysterious world of political diplomacy this was the reaction which was expected and is interpreted as being a 'good sign'. Sir Hugh Foot, excited by the scheme, commented on the Greek and Turkish reaction in these words: "That's the beauty of it. We never expected them to. This is our plan. We're going ahead with it. And it'll work . . ." It was hoped that neither side would accept the plan too hurriedly pushing one or other into the position of having to oppose! Such are the ways of politics, while the people, manipulated like puppets on strings, kill each other at the direction of their leaders.

It is impossible to say what the result of this plan will be until we hear more from Greece and Turkey. If accepted by each it is because they no longer consider it expedient to haggle with Britain over their respective claims: Turkish demands for partition and Greek proposals for union.

Last week Turkey was inciting its nationals in Cyprus to riot. Have we now to accept that the Turkish Government has suddenly seen the futility of such a course? Is it not that in fact the leaders were staging a show of strength in order to convince all concerned that they were a force to be reckoned with in any future plans for Cyprus?

While the British authorities were engaged in a struggle with EOKA, Turkey was content to sit and watch Greek Cypriots being killed, imprisoned and beaten with the aid of Turkish Cypriot policemen. But once the Turkish Government got wind of a British compromise deal with Makarios the futile rioting of last week, which ended in a number of brutal deaths, was planned.

And why, we may ask, was this "imaginative" scheme now put forward by Britain, not suggested years ago before the division between Greek and Turkish Cypriots ended in communal violence? For the same reasons which all Governments use when deciding who shall be sacrificed, and when—expediency and power. The recent riots in Cyprus gave the British Government a good reason for flying in thousands of troops and arms. Necessary for law and order, it piously tells the rest of the world, and even Greek Cypriots, who have no reason

ARKANSAS

A Backward S

LITTLE ROCK is in the news again, following on the decision by Federal Judge Harry Lemley that the Arkansas school board should be granted a delay of two-and-a-half years before having to continue with integration. This in effect reverses the ruling given last year by Judge Davies that the Central High School at Little Rock must immediately start integration in accordance with the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

It will be recalled that nine Negro students were admitted to the school, precipitating disorder amongst white segregationists, which was only put down eventually by part of the 101st Airborne Division. This year one student graduated and one was "expelled for throwing food at her tormentors". This, before Judge Lemley's new decision, left seven; these seven are now directed to attend a coloured school which is described as equal in its facilities to the Central High School, despite the agreed concept that separate but equal is of itself unequal and no longer to be tolerated.

Thus the principle established last

to love the British soldier, were glad to see them arriving!

We do not pretend to understand all the subtleties of Government policies at all times and on all levels, but we are categorical in our claim that it is not morality, justice or human need which in the long run governs the actions of any Government; it is power, political expediency and economic necessity.

year of actively co Supreme Court's gration with all even though the State, with much citizens, was attempting a means of avoidance falls to the ground segregationists with tory.

It is argued that order is reasonable conditions and to further violence re-opens in September even more arguable board has greatly danger just so the ment of Negro admission; the evidence Court has been given be heavily weighted ation of integration

But the main principle quite different. V ley's decision, even be "an exercise of tion and good judgment (words), there lies principle. If it was segregation should year ago, despite is still just. Further ion establishes a could well stand a for the segregation round, and it is not a series of simple favour of postponement throughout the D so an order made faith, but without sight as to its possibility could jeopardise gration over a United States.

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

June 28 1958

Threepence

"Freedom is something substantial. A man who is ignorant is not free. A man who is a tramp is not free. A man who sees his wife and children starving is not free. A man who must toil twelve hours a day in order to vegetate is not free. A man who is full of cares is not free. A wage-worker, whether labourer or clerk, who, every day for certain hours, must be at the beck and call of a 'master' is not free."

—LAWRENCE GRONLUND.

NOT SO TOUGH with Concessions

closely approxi-
London crews
from July 2nd.
s withdrawn his
will be an imme-
services of 10%,
r schedule reduc-
the strike began,
nion has yielded
the 8/6d. to the
be back-dated to

for the strikers
seven weeks, but
that someone will
2 million loss in
receipts during
form of fare in-
lanned, and it is
on Transport will
uce its consider-

nt economic sys-
f wage demands
s in living is in-
nsport is largely
ho have to foot
gher fares. This,
ng cost of food
als, means that
dustries have to,
and increases in
tinue to rise so
ll be made—the

result in the end is economic depres-
sion and unemployment. We may
then have a 'local skirmish' or a full-
scale war to solve national economic
difficulties, after which the routine
begins all over again. Only nowa-
days H-bombs are making the like-
lihood of survival after a war, en-
abling us to re-start our lunatic
course over again, very remote.
Some people think that annihilation
would be better for mankind. They
may be right. But, we prefer the
rational and humane course, and
suggest that we could begin to-
morrow to organise society in such
a way that the problems we have
just touched on could be eliminated
or, at least, reduced.

This would mean the abolition of
money, the State and the means by
which war can be waged. We
already know the reactions to these
suggestions from workers no less
than their leaders. The worker who
shows determination in a wages
struggle cannot yet see the connec-
tion between his wage demands and
all the other problems in society.
Until he does, and is also prepared
to take action to change the struc-
ture, then the whole crazy business
must continue.

Hungarian Executions What Happens Next?

THE murder of Imre Nagy, Pal
Malater and their two col-
leagues of the Hungarian uprising
has, for once, revolted the Western
world. Of itself the judicial execu-
tion of these men is an appalling
crime, with its background of cold,
calculated treachery, but it is also
very much more. It is a clear indi-
cation of the Soviet Union's attitude
towards Yugoslavia, and a grisly
warning to the men in Poland who
may now assume that Khrushchev
has reconsidered his previous line
and is now reverting to type—the
Stalin type.

It is quite possible that Khrush-
chev always intended to return to
the old policy of terror as soon as
he had established himself firmly in
power, and that his method of gain-
ing security of tenure was by tem-
porarily instigating a more liberal
policy. Conversely it is possible that
he is not as secure as appearances
indicate, and has been forced to his
present actions by the old Stalinists
lining up against him.

Either way the outlook for peace-
ful co-existence has not improved.
It cannot be supposed that the
Soviet Government expected any-
thing but censure from the West fol-
lowing upon the open admission of
the Nagy killing; it must therefore
be assumed that it did not care
what the reaction was, but was far
more interested in the effects created

in Communist countries.

One thing is certain; the U.S.A.
and Britain are now in an even
stronger position to disbelieve any
"suggestions for the furtherance of
peaceful co-operation" which may
emanate from the Soviet Union.
Since the Twentieth Congress it has
been difficult for the West to avoid
as much world criticism as the
Soviet Union on questions of the
genuineness of their desire for agree-
ment on disarmament, nuclear tests
and other matters. Now the West
can point to a further example for
distrust—and the United States will
find it easier to talk its way out of
a summit conference.

Meanwhile we must all await de-
velopments which will soon take
place and will give us a clue as to
the reason for Nagy's death, and
more important still, the reason for
the publicity surrounding the killing.
There are still at least three other
men who were in the last Nagy
Coalition Government, who's fates
are as yet undecided; a lot depends
in all probability, upon the actions
of Yugoslavia and Poland, but it
may be that the Soviet Government
no longer cares a hang for anyone's
opinions—for the present—and its
latest act is simply a proof of this
fact. The Soviet leaders have killed
before—and will no doubt kill
again.

ARKANSAS

A Backward Step

LITTLE ROCK is in the news
again, following on the decision
by Federal Judge Harry Lemley that
the Arkansas school board should
be granted a delay of two-and-a-half
years before having to continue with
integration. This in effect reverses
the ruling given last year by Judge

year of actively complying with the
Supreme Court's decision of "inte-
gration with all deliberate speed",
even though the Governor of the
State, with much support from white
citizens, was attempting to fabricate
a means of avoiding the decision,
falls to the ground.

Propaganda : SOME Anarchist Reflections

IN his letter on the "Problems of
Propaganda", printed in last
week's FREEDOM, our comrade
Arthur Ultheth writes that "the

even weeks, but that someone will 2 million loss in receipts during form of fare in- planned, and it is on Transport will duce its consider-

ent economic sys- of wage demands is in living is in- transport is largely who have to foot higher fares. This, ing cost of food als, means that industries have to, and increases in ntinue to rise so ill be made—the

national and international basis, and suggest that we could begin to- morrow to organise society in such a way that the problems we have just touched on could be eliminated or, at least, reduced.

This would mean the abolition of money, the State and the means by which war can be waged. We already know the reactions to these suggestions from workers no less than their leaders. The worker who shows determination in a wages struggle cannot yet see the connection between his wage demands and all the other problems in society. Until he does, and is also prepared to take action to change the structure, then the whole crazy business must continue.

It is quite possible that Khrushchev always intended to return to the old policy of terror as soon as he had established himself firmly in power, and that his method of gaining security of tenure was by temporarily instigating a more liberal policy. Conversely it is possible that he is not as secure as appearances indicate, and has been forced to his present actions by the old Stalinists lining up against him.

Either way the outlook for peaceful co-existence has not improved. It cannot be supposed that the Soviet Government expected anything but censure from the West following upon the open admission of the Nagy killing; it must therefore be assumed that it did not care what the reaction was, but was far more interested in the effects created

find it easier to talk its way out of a summit conference.

Meanwhile we must all await developments which will soon take place and will give us a clue as to the reason for Nagy's death, and more important still, the reason for the publicity surrounding the killing. There are still at least three other men who were in the last Nagy Coalition Government, who's fates are as yet undecided; a lot depends in all probability, upon the actions of Yugoslavia and Poland, but it may be that the Soviet Government no longer cares a hang for anyone's opinions—for the present—and its latest act is simply a proof of this fact. The Soviet leaders have killed before—and will no doubt kill again.

ARKANSAS

A Backward Step

LITTLE ROCK is in the news again, following on the decision by Federal Judge Harry Lemley that the Arkansas school board should be granted a delay of two-and-a-half years before having to continue with integration. This in effect reverses the ruling given last year by Judge Davies that the Central High School at Little Rock must immediately start integration in accordance with the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

It will be recalled that nine Negro students were admitted to the school, precipitating disorder amongst white segregationists, which was only put down eventually by part of the 101st Airborne Division. This year one student graduated and one was "expelled for throwing food at her tormentors". This, before Judge Lemley's new decision, left seven; these seven are now directed to attend a coloured school which is described as equal in its facilities to the Central High School, despite the agreed concept that separate but equal is of itself unequal and no longer to be tolerated.

Thus the principle established last

year of actively complying with the Supreme Court's decision of "integration with all deliberate speed", even though the Governor of the State, with much support from white citizens, was attempting to fabricate a means of avoiding the decision, falls to the ground, and provides the segregationists with a delayed victory.

It is argued that Judge Lemley's order is reasonable in view of local conditions and the likelihood of further violence when the school re-opens in September, though it is even more arguable that the school board has greatly exaggerated this danger just so that the postponement of Negro admission should be made; the evidence submitted to the Court has been generally agreed to be heavily weighted against continuation of integration for a period.

But the main point is something quite different. With Judge Lemley's decision, even supposing it to be "an exercise of equitable discretion and good judgment" (his own words), there lies the sacrifice of a principle. If it was just that school segregation should be enforced a year ago, despite local disorder—it is still just. Furthermore the decision establishes a precedent which could well stand as a flaming beacon for the segregationists to rally round, and it is not hard to visualise a series of similar decisions in favour of postponement being made throughout the Deep South. And so an order made perhaps in good faith, but without sufficient foresight as to its possible consequences, could jeopardise the cause of integration over a vast area of the United States.

to love the British soldier, were glad to see them arriving!

We do not pretend to understand all the subtleties of Government policies at all times and on all levels, but we are categorical in our claim that it is not morality, justice or human need which in the long run governs the actions of any Government; it is power, political expediency and economic necessity.

Propaganda :

SOME

Anarchist Reflections

IN his letter on the "Problems of Propaganda", printed in last week's FREEDOM, our comrade Arthur Uloth suggests that "something is wrong somewhere" when anarchism which "has been preached for over a hundred years in Europe, seems less likely to succeed now than it did fifty years ago". He does not think anarchist propagandists are to blame for not doing enough or that their propaganda is wrongly conceived. But earlier in his letter he suggests that

it would not be unfair to say that the anarchists, like the other "progressives" (hideous expression, but there seems no other comprehensive word) seem to have no other resources than that of reasoned argument, which is quite inadequate to influence people.

"Argument"—"that is our weapon also" writes A. J. P. Taylor in his Campaign Report* in which he attempts to assess the results so far achieved by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, with its public meetings, its marches, its pamphlets and its leaflets. In his opinion, and from his observations as an active speaker for the Campaign, it has succeeded in its first objective of rallying the converted and giving them "confidence by showing each of them that he is not alone". But so far as the rest of the population is concerned "my own feeling, which may well be wrong, is that our arguments are not yet finding their mark". Apart from the public's

Continued on p. 3

*New Statesman, June 21, 1958.

REPORT ON THE CO-OPS - 7

(Continued from previous issue)

IN this critical review of the *Co-operative Independent Commission Report* I have discussed only a few of its major recommendations, especially as they are likely to affect the declared social and democratic purposes of the Movement. To recapitulate briefly: the Commission advocates a far-reaching overhaul of the Movement to enable it to meet more effectively the challenge of its main competitors in the retail field, the private multiples. To this end the Movement should concentrate in the next decade or so on capturing an increasing proportion of the retail trade of the country. This will require the investment of some £150 millions in new enterprises and the rationalisation of its productive resources. A new national federal body should be set up which will open a chain of Co-op multiples for the sale of footwear and other dry goods. Under a plan of amalgamation the aim should be to reduce the number of societies from the present 950-odd to an 'ideal number' of 200-300, each society being based on a natural shopping catchment area. Finally, steps should be taken to improve Co-op management. This will involve a new conception of the rôles of the permanent officials and the governing committees respectively. To the officials will fall the job of actually managing the Co-ops, while the elected lay committees will be responsible for policy and the exercise of democratic control.

I have argued that these proposals are likely on balance to improve the efficiency of the Movement. The Commission may be unduly optimistic in believing that, at this stage, the Co-ops can muscle-in on territory already held by the private multiples, but there remains plenty of scope for the Co-ops contributing to the euthanasia of the small shopkeepers who, collectively, still pre-

dominate in the distributive sector of the economy. It may be, also, that the Commission over-estimates the advantages to be derived from radical amalgamation, while ignoring the disadvantages and possible alternatives. Taken all in all, however, if the Report were adopted *in toto* one might reasonably expect some improvement in the economic efficiency of the Movement. My major criticism is that this would almost certainly be bought at the expense of other aspects of the Movement. It involves, for example, a tacit abandonment of the ideal of a Co-operative Commonwealth. This is not very serious, since the ideal is now so vague as to be practically meaningless. More important, economic efficiency is likely to be bought at the expense of what has hitherto been regarded as Co-operative Democracy. Despite the Commission's avowed disclaimer, its proposals *will* weaken the element of 'lay democracy' and *will* accelerate the clearly evident tendency towards 'the managerial revolution' in the Co-ops. From being essentially a movement of the urban working class, it will become increasingly a movement of the urban middle class, and a movement effectively controlled by its managerial élite. To my way of thinking all this is too high a price to pay. I have no wish to preserve much of the *status quo* in the Co-ops but I would prefer a solution to their problems which would be more in harmony with the old ideals of the Co-op pioneers and less in keeping with the outlook of a (detached)

Isaac Wolfson or a fashionable 'new socialist'.

It ought to be said that there is nothing very new in the proposals of the Commission. The ideas that have gone into the making of the Report have been canvassed pretty thoroughly in the Movement during the past few years. The idea of a chain of Co-op multiples, for example, is the brain-child of a University lecturer in economics, Dr. Sidney Pollard. What the Commission has done is to collect together the ideas it fancied and weld them into a general plan of reorganisation. If action is the aim, this is not an unimportant achievement. The Report has cost a few thousand pounds to produce but Co-operators like most men, are more prone to listen to advice they have paid for than the advice they get gratuitously.

Having paid its money, is the Co-op Movement likely to take the choice offered it? It is perhaps too early yet to say.

The Report was only formally 'received' at the recent Co-op Congress and the restricted debate on it nearly fizzled out at once stage of the proceedings. A special Congress, however, is to be held in the autumn at which the real decision will be made and, meanwhile, sectional conferences will be held throughout the country to discuss the recommendations. Initial reactions are difficult to judge. The C.W.S. which, if the Commission has its way, will be quite radically transformed, has so far made no comment. The Co-op Union too

has passed no barred its official anything other than whatever that may be. Press, however, 'neutral' is. There have been comments from the top managers in favourably disposed might be.

The real decision or rejection will be made in the board of retail societies. opinion in this case by an article in *Agenda*, reporting a cross-section questionnaire commission's major is almost unanimous favour of the reduction. On the national chain of Co-ops majority is. Societies are about over amalgamation societies and, hence, voting strength in favour. And the question there is in favour of the proposals, opinion varies pending upon what was the chief officer of the society. course, are in the poll only. Opinion rooms still remain out and may change on the Report. But at the momentful whether so recommendations let alone the Re-

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

The Adventuress Jules Romains 15/-
The Love Man Gwyn Thomas 13/6
Granite and Rainbow Virginia Woolf 18/-
Social Class and Mental Illness A. B. Hollingshead and F.C. Redlich £3
Men Who Fought for Freedom Egon Larsen 15/-

Philip Holgate's London Anarchist ANARCHIST IDEAS

WHATEVER virtues the theme "What can anarchists do?" may have it can certainly not claim any originality in the title. Nevertheless I feel that a discussion under this heading can be very important to us, and that I am justified in using the period of the London Anarchist Group's Sunday evening lecture for this purpose. During the five years during which I have been associated with the anarchist movement in Britain there has been a tremendous amount of very frank self-criticism directed against the ideas which are traditionally associated with anarchism. The fury and ruthlessness with which anarchists are by tradition credited with in their attacks on tyrannous and oppressive institutions such as the Church and the State has been turned and directed against the movement itself and some of its most cherished theories.

If yet another example is needed to illustrate the workings of the dialectical process which is so often

more attempt to look again at anarchism and present a different view of it. At the best, I hope that it will stimulate a movement towards rethinking our ideas, not only in a critical destructive way, but with some view of building up a solid structure on what is left. I think that even a move in that direction will be of interest to those who stand on the brink of the anarchist movement I am quite happy to be saying this at a public meeting and not at some internal discussion.

* * *

FIRST of all I would like to analyse as well as possible the reasons why anarchist theory does not seem so solid and coherent as it did years ago, or in fact today in some parts of the world. Although I have used words such as 'disintegration' to describe the change, I certainly do not regard it as a bad thing. I rather see it as a sign of health and vitality in anarchism, which makes it possible to produce such destructive

ment. This will involve a new conception of the rôles of the permanent officials and the governing committees respectively. To the officials will fall the job of actually managing the Co-ops, while the elected lay committees will be responsible for policy and the exercise of democratic control.

I have argued that these proposals are likely on balance to improve the efficiency of the Movement. The Commission may be unduly optimistic in believing that, at this stage, the Co-ops can muscle-in on territory already held by the private multiples, but there remains plenty of scope for the Co-ops contributing to the euthanasia of the small shopkeepers who, collectively, still pre-

effectively controlled by its managerial élite. To may way of thinking all this is too high a price to pay. I have no wish to preserve much of the *status quo* in the Co-ops but I would prefer a solution to their problems which would be more in harmony with the old ideals of the Co-op pioneers and less in keeping with the outlook of a (detached)

autumn at which the real decision will be made and, meanwhile sectional conferences will be held throughout the country to discuss the recommendations. Initial reactions are difficult to judge. The C.W.S. which, if the Commission has its way, will be quite radically transformed, has so far made no comment. The Co-op Union too

of the society. course, are in the poll only. Opinion rooms still remain out and may change on the Republic. But at the momentful whether so recommendation let alone the Re-

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

The Adventuress Jules Romains 15/-
The Love Man Gwyn Thomas 13/6
Granite and Rainbow Virginia Woolf 18/-
Social Class and Mental Illness A. B. Holingshead and F.C. Redlich £3
Men Who Fought for Freedom Egon Larsen 15/-

Cheap Reprints . . .

Love in the South Seas Bengt Danielsson 2/6
Sweet Thursday John Steinbeck 2/6
The Wayward Bus John Steinbeck 2/-
To a God Unknown John Steinbeck 2/6
The Pastures of Heaven John Steinbeck 2/-

Second-Hand . . .

Black Power Richard Wright 17/6
New Road No. 4 Silone, Kafka, Lorca etc. 3/-
Psychotic Art Francis Reitman 6/-
Youth and Tomorrow Olaf Stapledon 2/6
Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe W.E.H. Lecky 7/6
The Russian Enigma Anton Ciliga 7/6
Selected Works of Tom Paine 5/6
Selected Work of Tom Paine 5/6
The Fields at Evening Ethel Mannin 4/-
Under a Glass Bell Anias Nin 3/6
A New Holy Alliance Emil Ludwig 2/6
Film and the Future Andrew Buchanan 3/6
A Point of Order Gwyn Thomas 3/-
Ploughman's Folly Edward H. Faulkner 2/6
Some Back Numbers "Politics" Magazine, each 2/-

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1

Philip Holgate's London Anarchist ANARCHIST IDEAS

WHATEVER virtues the theme "What can anarchists do?" may have it can certainly not claim any originality in the title. Nevertheless I feel that a discussion under this heading can be very important to us, and that I am justified in using the period of the London Anarchist Group's Sunday evening lecture for this purpose. During the five years during which I have been associated with the anarchist movement in Britain there has been a tremendous amount of very frank self-criticism directed against the ideas which are traditionally associated with anarchism. The fury and ruthlessness with which anarchists are by tradition credited with in their attacks on tyrannous and oppressive institutions such as the Church and the State has been turned and directed against the movement itself and some of its most cherished theories.

If yet another example is needed to illustrate the workings of the dialectical process which is so often scorned by libertarians it is that in the course of their search to extend libertarian theory to the new fields which have been opened by psychologists and sociologists, and to make use of their discoveries to enrich our theories in turn, many anarchists have been led towards ideas which have cut away at some of the very foundations of other aspects of anarchism. This has no doubt led many people who once regarded themselves as anarchists to feel that it no longer holds water as a complete theory, and go their ways, thinking and acting in a manner which has much in common with anarchism, and willingly owning their debt to it, but no longer needing or desiring to link their thoughts to a comprehensive anti-authoritarian root.

It has also led to a flurry of attempts to revise and redefine anarchism. This disintegration of the theory of anarchism has been paralleled by a numerical diminution in the effective strength of the movement, and I don't think it an exaggeration to say that we present, as a movement, a pretty poor show to anyone who inquires as to the possibility of putting our plans into practice.

Nevertheless, such a situation in which the anarchist movement in Britain finds itself has positive potentialities as well as negative realities. The theoretical shake-up has ensured that no unique idea or tendency has such an ascendancy as to crush others, or to push its rivals outside the bounds of anarchist respectability. The state of flux of the personal composition of the movement means that no group or individual can exert a stranglehold on it, and produce the disastrous consequences which have occurred in some countries. There are no public expressions of anarchist propaganda which so dominate the scene that anyone needs to feel compulsion to contribute to them. We are therefore in a position from which we could build up right from the beginning if we wished to, taking with us exactly as much as we like from the anarchism of the past and from what exists to-day.

I think that the process of disintegration has gone so far that I think it is time we started a re-synthesis of our ideas, and I hope to make a contribution to that to-night. At the worst, what I say will just be one

more attempt to look again at anarchism and a different view of it. At the best, I hope that it will stimulate a movement towards rethinking our ideas not only in a critical destructive way, but with some of building up a solid structure on what is left. I think that even a move in that direction will be of interest to those who stand on the brink of the anarchist movement I am quite happy to be saying this at a public meeting and not at some internal discussion.

* * *

FIRST of all I would like to analyse as well as the reasons why anarchist theory does not seem so solid and coherent as it did years ago, or in the past in some parts of the world. Although I have used words such as 'disintegration' to describe the change, I certainly do not regard it as a bad thing, rather as a sign of health and vitality in anarchism. It makes it possible to produce such destructive criticism and I hope to survive it. Anarchism has always regarded political parties as being their enemy and as being something to warn people against. Opposition to politics has been in part based on the conclusion that the type of organisation which is necessary to successfully contest elections and achieve change in the political field was inimicable to the achievement of freedom in society. Perhaps more however, the point of view is sympathetic to the one which the oppressed for their position rather than the oppressors, we have seen that the personal qualities which have brought to the fore and developed by political movements such as counting heads of membership, laying down following party lines, are those appropriate to a totalitarian social order and not to a free one.

The typical party member is required to place in the party whatever it be, and to play the part cast for him. This may be a boring and stultifying rôle such as collecting subscriptions or canvassing members. In a more subtle way a party member is expected to think the thoughts laid down for him, and of course I am defining the hard ideal and not the soft one that actual people fit exactly into this definition. He is expected, when involved in political action, to respond to any stimulus with the reply "Well, the policy is this . . ." or "The Communist Party follows this line . . ." Needless to say this is not to anarchist minds. The trouble starts when we look at ourselves in a mirror and start to wonder whether we are really different from the politicians.

It may be that in spite of rejecting and kicking away the outward forms of the authoritarian parties, anarchists are just as susceptible to the spirit which pervades them. This point could be driven home by inviting you to consider a caricature of an anarchist. He might call the politically spirited anarchist. He has all his energy and every waking minute to devote to it, but more important, and more typically, he answers to every possible question or objection with a shrug and a smile, and a word of chiasm on his lips waiting to be hurled at the mouth of an opponent. He is ready to state the interpretation of any piece of news from the papers abroad without a moment's hesitation. Of course a caricature doesn't exist and probably never

THE CO-OPS - 7

distributive sector

It may be, also, that the Commission over-estimates the value to be derived from the Co-ops, while ignoring the disadvantages and possible dangers. Even all in all, however, the proposals were adopted in the Movement during the past few years. The idea of a chain of Co-op multiples, for example, is the brain-child of a University lecturer in economics, Dr. Sidney Pollard. What the Commission has done is to collect together the ideas it fancied and weld them into a general plan of re-organisation. If action is the aim, this is not an unimportant achievement. The Report has cost a few thousand pounds to produce but Co-operators like most men, are more prone to listen to advice they have paid for than the advice they get gratuitously.

Having paid its money, is the Co-op Movement likely to take the choice offered it? It is perhaps too early yet to say.

The Report was only formally 'received' at the recent Co-op Congress and the restricted debate on it nearly fizzled out at once stage of the proceedings. A special Congress, however, is to be held in the autumn at which the real decision will be made and, meanwhile, sectional conferences will be held throughout the country to discuss the recommendations. Initial reactions are difficult to judge. The C.W.S. which, if the Commission has its way, will be quite radically transformed, has so far made no comment. The Co-op Union too

Isaac Wolfson or a fashionable 'new socialist'.

It ought to be said that there is nothing very new in the proposals of the Commission. The ideas that have gone into the making of the Report have been canvassed pretty thoroughly in the Movement during the past few years. The idea of a chain of Co-op multiples, for example, is the brain-child of a University lecturer in economics, Dr. Sidney Pollard. What the Commission has done is to collect together the ideas it fancied and weld them into a general plan of re-organisation. If action is the aim, this is not an unimportant achievement. The Report has cost a few thousand pounds to produce but Co-operators like most men, are more prone to listen to advice they have paid for than the advice they get gratuitously.

Having paid its money, is the Co-op Movement likely to take the choice offered it? It is perhaps too early yet to say.

The Report was only formally 'received' at the recent Co-op Congress and the restricted debate on it nearly fizzled out at once stage of the proceedings. A special Congress, however, is to be held in the autumn at which the real decision will be made and, meanwhile, sectional conferences will be held throughout the country to discuss the recommendations. Initial reactions are difficult to judge. The C.W.S. which, if the Commission has its way, will be quite radically transformed, has so far made no comment. The Co-op Union too

has passed no judgment and has barred its officials from advocating anything other than the official line, whatever that may be. The Co-op Press, however, while remaining 'neutral' is clearly sympathetic. There have been one or two asinine comments from Co-op leaders hostile to the Report, but most of the top managers in the Movement are favourably disposed—as well they might be.

The real decisions on acceptance or rejection will undoubtedly be made in the board-rooms of the 950 retail societies. A clue to present opinion in this quarter is provided by an article in the Co-op journal, *Agenda*, reporting the responses of a cross-section of 'societies' to a questionnaire concerning the Commission's major proposals. There is almost unanimous opinion in favour of the rationalisation of production. On the question of a national chain of Co-op multiples, the majority is decidedly against. Societies are about equally divided over amalgamation but the large societies and, hence, the overwhelming voting strength at Congress, are in favour. And on the management question there is a small majority in favour of the Commission's proposals, opinion varying markedly depending upon whether the respondent was the chief official or the president of the society. These answers, of course, are in the nature of a first poll only. Opinions within board-rooms still remain to be thrashed out and may change as the discussion on the Report gets under way. But at the moment it looks doubtful whether some of the major recommendations will be accepted, let alone the Report in its entirety.

There will be a strong tendency, my cynical self suspects, for societies to accept those recommendations which do not apply to them and to reject those that do—on the well-known principle that "it's 'im, not me, what's at fault".

In any case, even if some of the more important recommendations are accepted by the next Congress, there remains the problem of implementing resolutions. The principle of local autonomy for each society still obtains and no Congress resolution is likely to alter that. The majority might attempt various forms of moral persuasion on "recalcitrant" societies but in the last resort each society can 'go it alone'. To press too hard may lead to a splintering of the Movement.

The problem of re-organising the Co-op Movement is similar in some ways to that of re-organising local government. In many respects this country is still operating with a 19th century system of local government. But every proposal for reform has so far failed because the various local authorities involved cannot agree among themselves. However, there is an essential difference. A strong central government, willing to grasp the nettle, can decide in the end to ignore the 'vested interests' that stand in the way of local government reform. In the Co-op Movement, there is no such central government: reform cannot be imposed from without, it must come by the route of persuasion.

It is at this point one can see why so many Fabian-type socialists despair of the Co-ops. Neat and tidy plans of rationalisation cannot be implemented by legislative fiat in

Continued on p. 3

Philip Holgate's London Anarchist Group Lecture on ANARCHIST IDEAS TODAY

...treats the theme "What can anarchists have it can certainly not claim any title. Nevertheless I feel that a dis- heading can be very important to us, led in using the period of the London Sunday evening lecture for this pur- five years during which I have been anarchist movement in Britain there ous amount of very frank self-criti- the ideas which are traditionally archism. The fury and ruthlessness sts are by tradition credited with in tyrannous and oppressive institutions and the State has been turned and the movement itself and some of its ories.

...example is needed to illustrate the dialectical process which is so often

more attempt to look again at anarchism and present a different view of it. At the best, I hope that it may stimulate a movement towards rethinking our ideas not only in a critical destructive way, but with some idea of building up a solid structure on what is left. Since I think that even a move in that direction would be of interest to those who stand on the brink of the movement I am quite happy to be saying this at a public meeting and not at some internal discussion.

* * *

FIRST of all I would like to analyse as well as I can the reasons why anarchist theory does not seem so solid and coherent as it did years ago, or in fact does to-day in some parts of the world. Although I have used words such as 'disintegration' to describe this change, I certainly do not regard it as a bad thing, but rather as a sign of health and vitality in anarchism which makes it possible to produce such destructive self-

but at the same time I think that few of us would declare that we haven't at some times of our anarchist lives had at least some of the above characteristics lurking furtively in the background of our minds.

Well, we have to keep quiet about them now, because the atmosphere is full of psychological theories to show that in addition to having to admit a certain unpleasant truth in Lenin's remark that many formulations of the ideal anarchist society was a state in which everything was called by different names, and agreeing that anarchist organisations generally degenerate into political type organisations in fact, we now find ourselves faced with the final blow, that perhaps even the individual anarchist is not very much different in his attitude to the individual political person. When someone who has perhaps in pursuance of his libertarian ideas read up a bit of psychology, and made use of psychological arguments, is brought face to face with the charge that his

led by its mana-
may way of think-
too high a price to
wish to preserve
us quo in the Co-
prefer a solution to
which would be more
the old ideals of
ers and less in keep-
book of a (detached)

gress, however, is to be held in the
autumn at which the real decision
will be made and, meanwhile, sec-
tional conferences will be held
throughout the country to discuss
the recommendations. Initial re-
actions are difficult to judge. The
C.W.S. which, if the Commission
has its way, will be quite radically
transformed, has so far made no
comment. The Co-op Union too

was the chief official or the president
of the society. These answers, of
course, are in the nature of a first
poll only. Opinions within board-
rooms still remain to be thrashed
out and may change as the discus-
sion on the Report gets under way.
But at the moment it looks doubt-
ful whether some of the major
recommendations will be accepted,
let alone the Report in its entirety.

ernment reform. In the Co-op
Movement, there is no such central
government: reform cannot be im-
posed from without, it must come
by the route of persuasion.

It is at this point one can see why
so many Fabian-type socialists des-
pair of the Co-ops. Neat and tidy
plans of rationalisation cannot be
implemented by legislative fiat in

Continued on p. 3

Philip Holgate's London Anarchist Group Lecture on ANARCHIST IDEAS TODAY

rtues the theme "What can anarchists
have it can certainly not claim any
title. Nevertheless I feel that a dis-
heading can be very important to us,
ed in using the period of the London
Sunday evening lecture for this pur-
five years during which I have been
an anarchist movement in Britain there
ous amount of very frank self-criti-
st the ideas which are traditionally
archism. The fury and ruthlessness
ists are by tradition credited with in-
tyrannous and oppressive institutions
h and the State has been turned and
e movement itself and some of its
ories.

example is needed to illustrate the
dialectical process which is so often
rians it is that in the course of their
libertarian theory to the new fields
opened by psychologists and sociolo-
use of their discoveries to enrich our
any anarchists have been led towards
t away at some of the very founda-
cts of anarchism. This has no doubt
who once regarded themselves as
that it no longer holds water as a
and go their ways, thinking and acting
has much in common with anarchism,
ing their debt to it, but no longer
g to link their thoughts to a compre-
itarian root.

to a flurry of attempts to revise and
. This disintegration of the theory
een paralleled by a numerical dimin-
strength of the movement, and I
exaggeration to say that we present,
a pretty poor show to anyone who
possibility of putting our plans into

ch a situation in which the anarchist
n finds itself has positive potentialities
e realities. The theoretical shake-up
no unique idea or tendency has such
to crush others, or to push its rivals
of anarchist respectability. The state
sonal composition of the movement
up or individual can exert a strangle-
produce the disastrous consequences
in some countries. There are no
of anarchist propaganda which so
that anyone needs to feel compulsion
em. We are therefore in a position
uld build up right from the beginning
aking with us exactly as much as we
rchism of the past and from what

process of disintegration has gone so
is time we started a re-synthesis of
hope to make a contribution to that
worst, what I say will just be one

more attempt to look again at anarchism and present a
different view of it. At the best, I hope that it may
stimulate a movement towards rethinking our ideas not
only in a critical destructive way, but with some idea
of building up a solid structure on what is left. Since
I think that even a move in that direction would be
of interest to those who stand on the brink of the
movement I am quite happy to be saying this at a
public meeting and not at some internal discussion.

* * *

FIRST of all I would like to analyse as well as I can
the reasons why anarchist theory does not seem so
solid and coherent as it did years ago, or in fact does
to-day in some parts of the world. Although I have
used words such as 'disintegration' to describe this
change, I certainly do not regard it as a bad thing, but
rather as a sign of health and vitality in anarchism which
makes it possible to produce such destructive self-
criticism and I hope to survive it. Anarchists have
always regarded political parties as being their enemies,
and as being something to warn people against. This
opposition to politics has been in part based on the
conclusion that the type of organisation which is needed
to successfully contest elections and achieve power in
the political field was inimicable to the achievement of
freedom in society. Perhaps more however, and this
point of view is sympathetic to the one which blames
the oppressed for their position rather than the oppres-
sors, we have seen that the personal qualities which are
brought to the fore and developed by political activity
such as counting heads of membership, laying down and
following party lines, are those appropriate to an auth-
oritarian social order and not to a free one.

The typical party member is required to accept his
place in the party whatever it be, and to play a rôle
cast for him. This may be a boring and submissive
rôle such as collecting subscriptions or canvassing for
members. In a more subtle way a party member is
expected to think the thoughts laid down for him. Here
of course I am defining the hard ideal and not suggest-
ing that actual people fit exactly into this description.
He is expected, when involved in political discussion,
to respond to any stimulus with the reply "Well Labour's
policy is this . . ." or "The Communist Party takes the
following line . . ." Needless to say this is anathema
to anarchist minds. The trouble starts when we begin
looking at ourselves in a mirror and start wondering
whether we are really different from the political person.

It may be that in spite of rejecting and keeping clear
of the outward forms of the authoritarian political
parties, anarchists are just as susceptible to the spirit
which pervades them. This point could be driven home
by inviting you to consider a caricature of what one
might call the politically spirited anarchist. He devotes
all his energy and every waking minute to the cause,
but more important, and more typically, he has the
answer to every possible question or objection to anar-
chism on his lips waiting to be hurled at the first sign
of an opponent. He is ready to state the anarchist
interpretation of any piece of news from home or
abroad without a moment's hesitation. Of course this
caricature doesn't exist and probably never has done,

but at the same time I think that few of us would declare
that we haven't at some times of our anarchist lives
had at least some of the above characteristics lurking
furtively in the background of our minds.

Well, we have to keep quiet about them now, because
the atmosphere is full of psychological theories to show
that in addition to having to admit a certain unpleas-
ant truth in Lenin's remark that many formulations of
the ideal anarchist society was a state in which every-
thing was called by different names, and agreeing that
anarchist organisations generally degenerate into political
type organisations in fact, we now find ourselves faced
with the final blow, that perhaps even the individual
anarchist is not very much different in his attitude to
the individual political person. When someone who has
perhaps in pursuance of his libertarian ideas read up a
bit of psychology, and made use of psychological argu-
ments, is brought face to face with the charge that his
anarchism is really a means of escaping from his personal
problems, and that his visions of a free society are
rather unworthy projections of his inner fantasies, it
takes rather a tough mind to carry on being an anarchist.

Another factor that has contributed to a weakening
of anarchism is that it has become more obvious that
the hopes of anarchists of former days, that a radical
transformation of society by means of anarchist agitation
was at least a possibility worth fighting for, had no
real basis. For many revolutionaries in the past, and
even for some to-day there is a real possibility that their
ideal society will be realised within their lifetime and
so their revolutionary activity is very clearly in their
own interests. Acting in one's own interests plays a
large part in the theories of Max Stirner, the German
anarchist whose ideas exercised an influence in the
British Anarchist Movement a short time ago. They
assert that everything a person does is an expression of
his egotistic self-interest, and that the commendable, intel-
ligent person examines his actions in this light and tries
to see how he can further those interests in as rational
and successful a manner as possible. Taking that at
its face value would mean that no-one, except those
most prone to illusion, would be anarchists.

Interpreting ones "interests" in a narrowly hedonistic
sense, it is impossible that the activities of the anarchist
propagandist, or even the life of someone who really
tries to live according to an anti-totalitarian view of
life, in an authoritarian society could produce worthwhile
results under an egoistic scale of values. I am not
saying that this applies directly to the professing Stirner-
ites within the anarchist movement, but I would in
passing give the opinion that for everyone who has
really got some benefit from Stirnerism, two or three
have just ended up by being made so muddle-headed as
to be unable to do anything either for themselves or
for the movement, and have lapsed into a kind of aggres-
sive apathy which chiefly involves pouring scorn on their
former comrades who remain in the anarchist move-
ment. Of course not everyone does interpret 'con-
scious' self-interest in a narrowly hedonistic sense, but
when you start modifying that it takes a lot of the
force out of Stirner.

(To be continued)

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 26

June 28, 1958

PROPAGANDA

Continued from p. 1

blind faith in science producing the antidote to H-bomb destruction and the fatal ill-effects of radiation, Professor Taylor suggests that an important failing in the Campaign is that it is too prone to hedge in its objectives of unilateral disarmament with such qualifying remarks as "if necessary", and to refer to "first steps" when it should be insisting that nothing less than unilateral abandonment "here and now" is the only possible solution.

★

BUT where Arthur Uloth's "reasoned argument" and Prof. Taylor's "persistent argument" as a means to an end part company, is revealed when the Professor, in the last paragraph of his report declares "But we must never forget that ultimately we have to convert the Labour Party, just as the Anti-Corn-Law League converted Sir Robert Peel". In other words whereas the anarchist seeks the medium of argument to liberate man, the socialist (or should we say the social democrat?) merely asks to convert the public from one opinion to another on specific subjects of policy, believing that this mass opinion will then be able to put pressure on the "progressive" party, which for Prof. Taylor is the Labour Party, to adopt them if and when they take over the reins of government.

Even if we agree that in theory it is possible for these processes to operate in the Labour Party (though, in practise the Party conference is dominated by the dead hand of the Trades Unions' block votes) how will public pressure influence a Tory government whose policies, in any case, are not even determined at the Tory Party's annual conference?

Clearly, public opinion, even when enlightened by argument can do little in an authoritarian society to implement its will simply by relying on the validity, the rightness, the realism or the justice of its demands. We think it the height of political naiveté to imagine that even Labour politicians are open to persuasion by moral argument. It may be true—as Prof. Taylor suggests—that "most people have not

occupational risks to health, liberty and even to life that this may entail, far from entrusting their lives to them, would take the view than an individual, so consumed with a lust for power that he is prepared to sacrifice his life to its attainment, is not the kind of person in whom to entrust the life and liberty of others.

★

IT is not so much the single-mindedness of politicians which is pathological as the ends to which their single-mindedness is directed. The world has benefited by the single-mindedness of a Beethoven and a Toscanini. That of a Lenin and a Hitler has caused it untold misery. The public apathy to which we anarchists are continually referring; the public cynicism to which Prof. Taylor refers

(We slip into treating those who disagree with us as men of good will; whereas good will is merely another name for inaction. We encounter another obstacle. The essence of the Campaign is that a moral challenge can be stronger than nuclear weapons. People no longer believe this. They once thought that faith could move mountains. Now they doubt whether it can move molehills.)

these are factors with which we have to contend and overcome. But it is no use lulling ourselves into believing that we, the conscious socialists and anarchists have no responsibility for the existing state of affairs. When Arthur Uloth writes

Criticisms aimed at FREEDOM as a paper, and at the anarchist movement as a whole, are often due to a feeling of real frustration. One asks oneself, "Why does nothing ever happen? Perhaps the others are not doing enough? Perhaps I am not doing enough?" One generally tends to blame other people, because one usually feels oneself to be doing the best one can (one understands one's own difficulties better than an outsider, or at least one is more aware of their extent).

In reality however, no one is to blame.

like the ostrich, he is burying his head in the sand. Of course we are to blame! The anarchist and "progressive" movements get nowhere simply because we want to eat our cake and have it; because on the one hand we preach with Bakunin that we cannot be free so long as any of our fellow men are unfree, while on the other we act as if it were possible to find "solutions" for ourselves, islands of anarchy surrounded by oceans of misery and conflict! We act as if the unenlightened, apathetic masses should be attracted to us as moths are by a bright light. And we sit back, hoping to lure them with our "Trad Jazz" and our free love like share-

THE UNWRITTEN

PROFESSOR C. N. PARKINSON, the author of *Parkinson's Law* which was received rather coolly in these columns recently, and of *The Evolution of Political Thought*, which has been received rather coolly everywhere else, addressed the National Liberal Club in London last week, and, in the language of the *Daily Telegraph*, took his audience on a brisk gallop over some rare hunting country:

"Above all he wants political decentralisation. The burdens must be lightened. Home Rule for Scotland would be a start. Then federal government. Only national and international matters should remain with Westminster. Provincial legislatures would deal with the rest.

"Let Lancashire have nationalisation and the Thames Valley eschew it. Give the North a Health Service and let the South pay for medicine. You could move house to suit your tastes."

By this time, says the *Telegraph's* reporter, "the Professor's audience looked fairly stunned". I wasn't stunned (after all, the Liberals will say anything these days), but I was intrigued, not only because of the bearing of his views on the discussion in last week's FREEDOM on the relation between federalism and decentralisation, but also because his conception of a pluralist system of decentralised public services echoes what was said about the feasibility of breaking up the Post Office, (*The Myth of the Post Office*, FREEDOM 31/8/57), where in illustrating the conclusion that there is no essential connection between centralised government and the running of nationwide, in fact of internationalised public services, a picture was drawn of "Ideological rivalry between say, the worker-controlled Lancashire Post Office, the municipal one in Manchester, and the private enterprise one in Cheshire".

I don't suppose the Liberals took Professor Parkinson's remarks seriously. Not because I equate decentralisation with anarchism except in the sense that anarchy is the ultimate decentralisation, but because if we think of anarchism as apocalyptic utopianism, we must recognise the decentralist attitude as its prerequisite. Kropotkin declared in *Modern Science and Anarchism* that man will be compelled to find new forms of organisation for the social functions which the State now fulfils through the bureaucracy and that "as long as this is not done nothing will be done".

Continually you meet people who heartily agree with anarchist arguments but declare sadly that in the complex conditions of modern society, anarchy would never work. When they say that the whole historical trend of the last hundred years has been towards ever more government they are right, it is in their assumption that this must go on indefinitely, that it is some inevitable law of history, that they are wrong, but who can blame them for thinking as they do?

★

FOR the brains, like the military iron-mongery, are sold to the big battalions. In the last few years an immense amount

PEOPLE A

The last nine months publication of

The Growth of Political Thought in Great Britain by M. Eliasberg (National Endowment for Research, Princeton)

The Organisation of Government 1914-1919 by Chester (Study Group of Public Administration, University of Chester & Unwin).

Central Administration by W. J. MacKenzie (Macmillan).

The Growth of Government and Economic Planning

Between them they cost £4 14s. 6d., and it is sad to think of all this thought, so weight of learning, the same period to the alternatives to government that during these nineteen years, in *kin's Conquest of Poland*, *Selected Works in Spanish*, *Aires*, and *Kropotkin's Philosophy and Idealism*, would be rather if we thought that accompanied by an anarchism written in the and in terms of the And not only in the languages.

To my mind the most of the unwritten history of the century anarchism is of the insights of the thinkers, Godwin, Proudhon, Kropotkin, but its working of them. But it is subjects perfectionism, conspiratorial romanticism; it draws on anarchists their most questionable ideas, them the subtler conceptions (and neglected by thinkers like Landauer). It also adds the evolution of this century by the psychology and anti-technical change.

It is still an anarchist permanent protest—nothing else in our present is one which recognises the difference between authority and permanent aspect of the and not something to be by a vaguely specific. It recognises that the libertarian and authoritarian occurs every day and the extent to which we or are fobbed off with imagination and invention alternatives to, the tions to small problems which we are their big affairs. We are the course of events, arms race, imperialism

mately we have to convert the Labour Party, just as the Anti-Corn-Law League converted Sir Robert Peel". In other words whereas the anarchist seeks the medium of argument to liberate man, the socialist (or should we say the social democrat?) merely asks to convert the public from one opinion to another on specific subjects of policy, believing that this mass opinion will then be able to put pressure on the "progressive" party, which for Prof. Taylor is the Labour Party, to adopt them if and when they take over the reins of government.

Even if we agree that in theory it is possible for these processes to operate in the Labour Party (though, in practise the Party conference is dominated by the dead hand of the Trades Unions' block votes) how will public pressure influence a Tory government whose policies, in any case, are not even determined at the Tory Party's annual conference?

Clearly, public opinion, even when enlightened by argument can do little in an authoritarian society to implement its will simply by relying on the validity, the rightness, the realism or the justice of its demands. We think it the height of political naiveté to imagine that even Labour politicians are open to persuasion by moral argument. It may be true—as Prof. Taylor suggests—that "most people have not grasped the extent of the devastation that nuclear warfare will cause", but can this be said of the politicians, and in particular, politicians as politically "worldly" as Mr. Bevan or Mr. Strachey?

★

THE fact is that politicians would no more be able to engage in "diplomacy" and government if they allowed themselves to be influenced by moral considerations, the consequences of H-warfare, or even civil war, than a motorist would be able to drive a car if he were permanently haunted by the fear of death at every cross-road. Indeed life itself is a risk, and if we allowed our minds to be influenced by the complexity of the human organism, or its vulnerability to disease and unbalance, surely no reasonable person would accept to live! We accept the risk and forget about it. Similarly politicians however much they may hope to achieve their ends by persuasion, recognise that in the final analysis authority must have the backing of force. For these men the urge to dominate, to be in the public eye, is as strong as the urge to live is in man in general. Both accept the hazards involved. If more people realised that political leaders in pursuit of their ambition for power, are prepared to sacrifice the simple pleasures of life, deny themselves leisure and relaxation, and voluntarily* accept all the

these are factors with which we have to contend and overcome. But it is no use lulling ourselves into believing that we, the conscious socialists and anarchists have no responsibility for the existing state of affairs. When Arthur Uloth writes

Criticisms aimed at FREEDOM as a paper, and at the anarchist movement as a whole, are often due to a feeling of real frustration. One asks oneself, "Why does nothing ever happen? Perhaps the others are not doing enough? Perhaps I am not doing enough?" One generally tends to blame other people, because one usually feels oneself to be doing the best one can (one understands one's own difficulties better than an outsider, or at least one is more aware of their extent).

In reality however, no one is to blame.

like the ostrich, he is burying his head in the sand. Of course we are to blame! The anarchist and "progressive" movements get nowhere simply because we want to eat our cake and have it; because on the one hand we preach with Bakunin that we cannot be free so long as any of our fellow men are unfree, while on the other we act as if it were possible to find "solutions" for ourselves, islands of anarchy surrounded by oceans of misery and conflict! We act as if the unenlightened, apathetic masses should be attracted to us as moths are by a bright light. And we sit back, hoping to lure them with our "Trad Jazz" and our free love like shareholders waiting for their dividends. And some of us are surprised when no one turns up!

Prof. Taylor for his part refers to another cleavage in our audiences which it is even more urgent to overcome. The Campaign is a movement of eggheads for eggheads. We get a few trade union leaders, themselves crypto-eggheads. We get no industrial workers. He largely blames the Labour Party which "has done us great harm, and done it deliberately". As comrade Uloth writes, "one generally tends to blame other people . . .". If the Campaign remains a movement of "egg-heads" may it not be the fault of the egg-heads who seek to build up a mass public opinion to manipulate it politically instead of stating unequivocally that unilateral dis-

*It is important to stress the voluntary nature of the risk. After all, a miner or professional soldier (rank and file) takes on the job, and the risks, without dreams of power. It's a job. One does not embark on a political career in the same spirit! In any case someone who can be a successful politician could easily find a job as a lawyer, a school-teacher . . . or a house-painter!

†We might appear to be overstating our case if one thinks of Churchill as a typical example. But compared with a Hitler, a Lenin or a Mussolini, Churchill is an amateur, born with a political spoon in his mouth. Even as a brick-layer he was only an amateur! Nevertheless, even Churchill the amateur military strategist had little respect for the lives of others when it came to pursuing a policy, whether in Gallipoli or at Potsdam.

the Post Office, (*The Myth of the Post Office*, FREEDOM 31/8/57), where in illustrating the conclusion that there is no essential connection between centralised government and the running of nationwide, in fact of internationalised public services, a picture was drawn of "Ideological rivalry between say, the worker-controlled Lancashire Post Office, the municipal one in Manchester, and the private enterprise one in Cheshire".

I don't suppose the Liberals took Professor Parkinson's remarks seriously. Not because I equate decentralisation with anarchism except in the sense that anarchy is the ultimate decentralisation, but because if we think of anarchism as apocalyptic utopianism, we must recognise the decentralist attitude as its prerequisite. Kropotkin declared in *Modern Science and Anarchism* that man will be compelled to find new forms of organisation for the social functions which the State now fulfils through the bureaucracy and that "as long as this is not done nothing will be done".

Continually you meet people who heartily agree with anarchist arguments but declare sadly that in the complex conditions of modern society, anarchy would never work. When they say that the whole historical trend of the last hundred years has been towards ever more government they are right, it is in their assumption that this *must* go on indefinitely, that it is some inevitable law of history, that they are wrong, but who can blame them for thinking as they do?

★

FOR the brains, like the military iron-mongery, are sold to the big battalions. In the last few years an immense amount of study, research, investigation, tabulation, statistical analysis, and Ph.D. mongering has been done on the growth of government; while a pathetic quantity of amateur journalism, after-dinner flippancy and wishful thinking has gone into the search for those "new forms of organisation for the social functions which the State now fulfils through the bureaucracy".

armament is only possible when workers engaged on the production of these weapons will be prepared to stop producing them. This means giving up lucrative jobs, and looking for employment elsewhere. "Argument" *plus economic sacrifice* . . . for the workers. And the "egg-heads"? What material sacrifices are *they* offering to the cause of freedom from nuclear obliteration and burial under moral molehills?

People do respond to example. When we direct our appeal to their heads from our heads, is it surprising that their response is "so what?" When heart and head combine then we have no doubt that something will happen.

BUT let us be quite clear about three things:

- (1) that no politician has a heart
- (2) that "as ye sow so shall ye reap"
- (3) that argument without example is a lamp without the current.

To my mind the of the unwritten century anarchism is of the insights of thinkers, Godwin, Kropotkin, but its wing of them. But rejects perfectionism, conspiratorial roman optimism; it draws anarchists their most questionable id them the subtler (and neglected be thinkers like Lard It also adds the this century by the psychology and an technical change.

It is still an anarc permanent protest— thing else in our pr is one which recogn between authority a manent aspect of t and not something by a vaguely specif It recognises that libertarian and au occurs every day an the extent to which or are fobbed off w agination and inven alternatives to, the tions to small probl which we are their big affairs. We are the course of even arms race, imperial

Co

the Co-op Moven techniques of p simply do not app of local autonomy obstacle in the p dictator, benevol Equally clearly, as a conservative nical sense; it t maintenance of th a libertarian socie kind is obviously arguable whether a movement such tive which has to tion of its rivals i

PROGRESS OF WEEK 25

Deficit on Freedom Contributions re DEFICIT

June 13 t

Merriott: M.A.W. 7/6
Rockefeller Centre: D.
L.C.W. 10/-; Preston:
T.D. 6/-; Merriott: M.

Previously acknowle

1958 TOTAL TO

GIFTS OF BOOKS: L
Anon; London: Anon.

*Indicates regi

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

THE UNWRITTEN HANDBOOK

PROFESSOR C. N. PARKINSON, the author of *Parkinson's Law* which was received rather coolly in these columns recently, and of *The Evolution of Political Thought*, which has been received rather coolly everywhere else, addressed the National Liberal Club in London last week, and, in the language of the *Daily Telegraph*, took his audience on a brisk gallop over some rare hunting country:

"Above all he wants political decentralisation. The burdens must be lightened. Home Rule for Scotland would be a start. Then federal government. Only national and international matters should remain with Westminster. Provincial legislatures would deal with the rest.

"Let Lancashire have nationalisation and the Thames Valley eschew it. Give the North a Health Service and let the South pay for medicine. You could move house to suit your tastes."

By this time, says the *Telegraph's* reporter, "the Professor's audience looked fairly stunned". I wasn't stunned (after all, the Liberals will say *anything* these days), but I was intrigued, not only because of the bearing of his views on the discussion in last week's *FREEDOM* on the relation between federalism and decentralisation, but also because his conception of a pluralist system of decentralised public services echoes what was said about the feasibility of breaking up the Post Office, (*The Myth of the Post Office*, *FREEDOM* 31/8/57), where in illustrating the conclusion that there is no essential connection between centralised government and the running of nationwide, in fact of internationalised public services, a picture was drawn of "Ideological rivalry between say, the worker-controlled Lancashire Post Office, the municipal one in Manchester, and the private enterprise one in Cheshire".

I don't suppose the Liberals took Professor Parkinson's remarks seriously. Not because I equate decentralisation with anarchism except in the sense that anarchy is the ultimate decentralisation, but because if we think of anarchism as apocalyptic utopianism, we must recognise the decentralist attitude as its prerequisite. Kropotkin declared in *Modern Science and Anarchism* that man will be compelled to find new forms of organisation for the social functions which the State now fulfils through the bureaucracy and that "as long as this is not done nothing will be done".

Continually you meet people who heartily agree with anarchist arguments but declare sadly that in the complex conditions of modern society, anarchy would never work. When they say that the whole historical trend of the last hundred years has been towards ever more government they are right, it is in their assumption that this *must* go on indefinitely, that it is some inevitable law of history, that they are wrong, but who can blame them for thinking as they do?



FOR the brains, like the military ironmongery, are sold to the big battalions. In the last few years an immense amount

The last nine months have seen the publication of

The Growth of Public Employment in Great Britain by M. Abramovitz & V. Eliasberg (National Bureau of Economic Research, Princeton University Press).

The Organisation of British Central Government 1914-1956, ed. by D. N. Chester (Study Group of the Royal Institute of Public Administration, Allen & Unwin).

Central Administration in Britain by W. J. MacKenzie & J. W. Grove (Longmans).

The Growth of Government (Political and Economic Planning).

Between them they have 1,128 pages, cost £4 14s. 6d., and weigh 4lb. 2 ozs. It is sad to think of the tiny percentage of all this thought, scholarship, and sheer weight of learning, that has gone in the same period to the elaboration of the alternatives to government, and the news that during these nine months Kropotkin's *Conquest of Bread* has been published in Polish in Warsaw, Bakunin's *Selected Works* in Yiddish in Buenos Aires, and Kropotkin's *Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal* in Hebrew in Jerusalem, would be rather more welcome if we thought that they would be accompanied by an exposition of anarchism written in the twentieth century and in terms of the twentieth century. And not only in those cities and those languages.

To my mind the most striking feature of the unwritten handbook of twentieth century anarchism is not in its rejection of the insights of the classical anarchist thinkers, Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, but its widening and deepening of them. But it is selective, it rejects perfectionism, utopian fantasy, conspiratorial romanticism, revolutionary optimism; it draws from the classical anarchists their most valid, not their most questionable ideas. And it adds to them the subtler contribution of later (and neglected because untranslated) thinkers like Landauer and Malatesta. It also adds the evidence provided in this century by the social sciences, by psychology and anthropology, and by technical change.

It is still an anarchism of present and permanent protest—how could it be anything else in our present peril? But it is one which recognises that the conflict between authority and liberty is a permanent aspect of the human condition and not something that can be resolved by a vaguely specified social revolution. It recognises that the choice between libertarian and authoritarian solutions occurs every day and in every way, and the extent to which we choose, or accept, or are fobbed off with, or lack the imagination and inventiveness to discover alternatives to, the authoritarian solutions to small problems is the extent to which we are their powerless victims in big affairs. We are powerless to change the course of events over the nuclear arms race, imperialism and so on, pre-

cisely because we have surrendered our power over everything else. Or, more accurately, I think that the unwritten handbook would interpret it in terms of the power-vacuum. The vacuum created by the organisational requirements of a society in a period of rapid population growth and industrialisation at a time when unrestricted exploitation had to yield to a growing extent to the demands of the exploited, has been filled by the State, because of the weakness, inadequacy or incompleteness of libertarian alternatives. Thus the State, in its rôle as a form of social organisation rather than in its basic function as an instrument of internal and external coercion, is not so much the villain of the piece as the result of the inadequacy of the other answers to social needs.

This is the implication of Gustav Landauer's profound contribution to anarchist thought:

"The State is a condition, a certain relationship between human beings, a mode of human behaviour; we destroy it behaving differently."



THE unwritten handbook, using the immense amount of study that has been made, in the last twenty years, on social groups of all kinds, examines these "other relationships". What has gone wrong with them? it asks. Why has the trade union movement got bogged down in the morass of reformist politics, demanding nothing more than better wages and conditions? Why has the producer co-operative movement failed to expand? Why has consumer co-operation, after such ambitious aspirations, become little more than a dowdy elder sister of the chain stores? Why did the Friendly Societies and the voluntary hospital system fail to provide the comprehensive health service, which the cumbersome and expensive machinery of the NHS had to be initiated to supply? Was the last word in the organisation of public education said by the Act of 1870, on which all subsequent elaborations have been based? Is nationalisation the only alternative to private capitalism in industrial organisation? Why is the local government system a byword for bumbledom and petty officialdom, and how does this affect anarchist notions of local autonomy?

It is because they attempt to examine some of these questions that some of the series that appear in *FREEDOM*, for instance, Geoffrey Ostergaard's study of "The Tradition of Workers' Control" and Gaston Gerard's current authoritative examination of the Independent Commission's report on the Co-operative Movement, are of such value for people who want to hammer out a social as well as an individual conception of anarchism, which is something more than slogans and shibboleths and which takes into account the actual experiences of industrial societies in this century. They are notes for the unwritten handbook.

C.W.

...which we have come. But it is lives into believ-iscious socialists no responsibility rate of affairs. writes

FREEDOM as a chist movement as e to a feeling of asks oneself, "Why en? Perhaps the enough? Perhaps ?" One generally eople, because one e be doing the best ds one's own diffi- outsider, or at least their extent).

...one is to blame, is burying his Of course we are rchist and "pro- ts get nowhere want to eat our cause on the one th Bakunin that o long as any of unfree, while on s if it were pos- tions" for our- anarchy surrou- misery and con- if the unenligh- asses should be omths are by a d we sit back, with our "Trad- love like share- their dividends. e surprised when

his part refers to in our audiences re urgent to over- is a movement of s. We get a few themselves crypto- industrial workers. the Labour Party s great harm, and ". As comrade e generally tends ple...". If the a movement of not be the fault ho seek to build opinion to mani- instead of stating t unilateral dis-

stress the voluntary After all, a miner tier (rank and file) d the risks, without t's a job. One does political career in the y case someone who al politician could a lawyer, a schoo- house-painter!

o be overstating our of Churchill as a ut compared with a Mussolini, Churc- born with a political n. Even as a brick- n amateur! Never- rchill the amateur ad little respect for hen it came to pur- ther in Gallipoli or

the Post Office, (The Myth of the Post Office, FREEDOM 31/8/57), where in illustrating the conclusion that there is no essential connection between centralised government and the running of nation-wide, in fact of internationalised public services, a picture was drawn of "Ideological rivalry between say, the worker-controlled Lancashire Post Office, the municipal one in Manchester, and the private enterprise one in Cheshire".

I don't suppose the Liberals took Professor Parkinson's remarks seriously. Not because I equate decentralisation with anarchism except in the sense that anarchy is the ultimate decentralisation, but because if we think of anarchism as apocalyptic utopianism, we must recognise the decentralist attitude as its prerequisite. Kropotkin declared in *Modern Science and Anarchism* that man will be compelled to find new forms of organisation for the social functions which the State now fulfils through the bureaucracy and that "as long as this is not done nothing will be done".

Continually you meet people who heartily agree with anarchist arguments but declare sadly that in the complex conditions of modern society, anarchy would never work. When they say that the whole historical trend of the last hundred years has been towards ever more government they are right, it is in their assumption that this *must* go on indefinitely, that it is some inevitable law of history, that they are wrong, but who can blame them for thinking as they do?



FOR the brains, like the military iron-mongery, are sold to the big battalions. In the last few years an immense amount of study, research, investigation, tabulation, statistical analysis, and Ph.D. mongering has been done on the growth of government; while a pathetic quantity of amateur journalism, after-dinner flippancy and wishful thinking has gone into the search for those "new forms of organisation for the social functions which the State now fulfils through the bureaucracy".

armament is only possible when workers engaged on the production of these weapons will be prepared to stop producing them. This means giving up lucrative jobs, and looking for employment elsewhere. "Argument" *plus economic sacrifice*... for the workers. And the "egg-heads"? What material sacrifices are they offering to the cause of freedom from nuclear obliteration and burial under moral molehills?

People do respond to example. When we direct our appeal to their heads from our heads, is it surprising that their response is "so what?" When heart and head combine then we have no doubt that something will happen.

BUT let us be quite clear about three things:

- (1) that no politician has a heart
- (2) that "as ye sow so shall ye reap"
- (3) that argument without example is a lamp without the current.

languages.

To my mind the most striking feature of the unwritten handbook of twentieth century anarchism is not in its rejection of the insights of the classical anarchist thinkers, Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, but its widening and deepening of them. But it is selective, it rejects perfectionism, utopian fantasy, conspiratorial romanticism, revolutionary optimism; it draws from the classical anarchists their most valid, not their most questionable ideas. And it adds to them the subtler contribution of later (and neglected because untranslated) thinkers like Landauer and Malatesta. It also adds the evidence provided in this century by the social sciences, by psychology and anthropology, and by technical change.

It is still an anarchism of present and permanent protest—how could it be anything else in our present peril? But it is one which recognises that the conflict between authority and liberty is a permanent aspect of the human condition and not something that can be resolved by a vaguely specified social revolution. It recognises that the choice between libertarian and authoritarian solutions occurs every day and in every way, and the extent to which we choose, or accept, or are fobbed off with, or lack the imagination and inventiveness to discover alternatives to, the authoritarian solutions to small problems is the extent to which we are their powerless victims in big affairs. We are powerless to change the course of events over the nuclear arms race, imperialism and so on, pre-

ged down in the morass of reformist politics, demanding nothing more than better wages and conditions? Why has the producer co-operative movement failed to expand? Why has consumer co-operation, after such ambitious aspirations, become little more than a dowdy elder sister of the chain stores? Why did the Friendly Societies and the voluntary hospital system fail to provide the comprehensive health service, which the cumbersome and expensive machinery of the NHS had to be initiated to supply? Was the last word in the organisation of public education said by the Act of 1870, on which all subsequent elaborations have been based? Is nationalisation the only alternative to private capitalism in industrial organisation? Why is the local government system a byword for bumbledom and petty officialdom, and how does this affect anarchist notions of local autonomy?

It is because they attempt to examine some of these questions that some of the series that appear in FREEDOM, for instance, Geoffrey Ostergaard's study of "The Tradition of Workers' Control" and Gaston Gerard's current authoritative examination of the Independent Commission's report on the Co-operative Movement, are of such value for people who want to hammer out a social as well as an individual conception of anarchism, which is something more than slogans and shibboleth's and which takes into account the actual experiences of industrial societies in this century. They are notes for the unwritten handbook.

C.W.

Co-ops Conclusion

Continued from p. 2

the Co-op Movement. The standard techniques of political socialism simply do not apply. The principle of local autonomy is clearly a major obstacle in the path of any central dictator, benevolent or otherwise. Equally clearly, the principle acts as a conservative force in the technical sense; it tends towards the maintenance of the *status quo*. In a libertarian society a force of this kind is obviously desirable. It is arguable whether it is desirable in a movement such as the Co-operative which has to meet the competition of its rivals in order to survive.

Too slow a rate of innovation may be fatal. The fact remains that, relatively, the Co-ops are not making headway; they are marking time, and, unless changes happen soon, they may find themselves actually slipping.

The 'Co-ops' find themselves, therefore, faced with the old dilemma. How many of one's principles should one be prepared to sacrifice in order to survive? Is it possible to survive at all without imitating the principles of one's opponents? And, if one imitates them, what exactly has survived? It past history is any guide, the Co-op Movement generally chooses 'survival' rather than 'principles'—but usually only after a considerable time-lag. Its constitution based on 'open membership', provides the means by which the Movement in the long run adapts itself to changing circumstances; in the world as it is only a closed oligarchy can remain 'pure'. For the Co-op Movement, however, it looks as though time is now running out. *Without* radical changes, this century may see the eclipse of the Co-op Movement as we know it to-day. *With* radical changes, such as envisaged in the Report, the Co-op Movement will survive but only in a very different form.

GASTON GERARD.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 25

Deficit on Freedom	£500
Contributions received	£325
DEFICIT	£175

June 13 to June 19

Merriott: M.A.W. 7/6; London: E.P. £1/0/0;
Rockefeller Centre: D.A. £1/0/0; Dovercourt:
L.C.W. 10/-; Preston: R.S.M. 5/-; Glasgow:
T.D. 6/-; Merriott: M.A.W. 5/-.

Total	3 14 6
Previously acknowledged	321 10 7
1958 TOTAL TO DATE	£328 5 1

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: C.F.; London:
Anon; London: Anon.

*Indicates regular contributor.

Perennial Problem

S.F.'s witty letter in *FREEDOM* (7/6/58) deserves a better reply than it has yet received from either the editors or the 'Reader' who rallied to their defence (14/6/58). Whether or not one agrees with S.F.'s conception of the paper's function or his judgment on the general standard of performance of its contributors, his letter raises an important organisational problem. It is a problem which all organisations face but which presents special difficulties for anarchists.

The problem is one of finding new blood. However rich in corpuscles the blood of the founders or present leaders of an organisation may be, it is inevitable that sooner or later it begins to turn to water. Unless a transfusion takes place the result is likely to be debilitating, at least in appearance. Objectively, perhaps, the activities of the organisation may appear sound, even better than in the past—since skill and experience count for something—but they lack the spark of crude vitality.

As an example of what I mean let me cite our contemporary, the *New Statesman*. The *N.S.* is probably still the best of the political weeklies with anything like a mass circulation. But for years now it has suffered from a kind of spiritual clap. I get the impression—and I am not alone in this—that the same old horses are leaping the same old fences; polished performances all, but lacking in vigour. Compare it with the *Spectator* which a few years back came under new management. I dislike the teddy-boy politics of the *Spectator* more than I dislike the spinsterish whimpers of the *New Statesman* but I have to admit that the *Spectator* has got something which the *N.S.* hasn't: it's well and truly alive. The *N.S.* had a halfhearted face-lift recently but I have little doubt that it won't really begin to sparkle again until dear old Kingsley Martin is pensioned off and a new editor collects together another set of boys.

Many organisations, recognising the general problem, have institutionalised means of solving it to some extent. They introduce compulsory retiring ages or procedures whereby elected officers are required to stand down for a period before seeking re-election. These means do not commend themselves very much to anarchists: they savour too much of bureaucracy. Anarchist organisations also often suffer from the fact that work in them offers for most people very little reward, either material or psychic in nature. There is, therefore, rarely a surplus of talent pressing its take-over bid as there is in organisations offering high monetary or prestige rewards.

This in itself might not be too serious a drawback were there not further difficulties still. One of the most important of these is that anarchist organisations must inevitably be to some extent oligarchic in character if they are to remain anarchist. A feature of a democratic organisations is that membership is open to all who subscribe to its principles and, in practice, too close a scrutiny of a potential member's principles is not made. With open membership it becomes possible, therefore, for new men and new ideas to make themselves felt over a period of time. But democracy is often paid for by the sacrifice of the original principles: the organisation is eventually transformed into something which its founders would scarcely recognise. The Co-op Movement is a good case in point.

Anarchists have long appreciated all this. To prevent the subversion of anarchist organisations they have adopted the functional principle which in practice means that the organisation consists of a closed group of activists. In its internal arrangements the group may be, and usually is, democratic to the ultimate degree, working according to the unanimity principle. But in its relationship to outsiders, including those who might consider themselves to be in some sense 'members' of the amorphous anarchist movement, the group presents the appearance of an oligarchy.

The anarchist functional group, of course, rarely maintains the same membership over any lengthy period of time: even anarchists are mortal! Original members drop out for one reason or another—the unanimity principle no doubt sometimes contributing to intra-group tensions. New members are brought in but only by the oligarchic method of co-option. Doubtless some or most of these new recruits 'choose themselves' in the sense that their outside activities have made them the most likely candidates. But there is, of course, no guarantee that this procedure will result in the best available recruits being obtained.

Oligarchy is to be commended in certain circumstances but it suffers from a number of inherent defects. Anarchist oligarchy is no exception. One of these defects is that it tends to generate a feeling of apathy on the part of the outsiders. The division between 'we' and 'they' begins to manifest itself very rapidly. This division cannot be bridged by name-calling between the parties. It is no use the outsiders muttering about the authoritarian tendencies of the insiders and it is no use the insiders mut-

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

tering about the lack of responsibility of the outsiders. The tension between the two sets of people is inherent in this type of organisation.

The matter is further complicated by anarchist ideology with its anti-authoritarian bias and its assumption that individual spontaneity exists and is highly commendable. Spontaneity undoubtedly exists, especially among anarchists, but I am not sure that it can be relied upon to produce the desired results in a tiny movement such as ours. As an outsider who has been around and about the movement for over ten years, I know that plenty of scope exists for people willing to do their bit. I believe that, in the last few years especially, I have spontaneously contributed a bit. Rather more has been contributed because I have been prompted by the editors. Looking back I feel that I might have contributed even more if some means existed, other than sporadic editorial appeals, to prompt my spontaneous instincts. I was around and about the movement for some years before, in some form or another, I found a niche as an occasional contributor to *FREEDOM* and lecturer at anarchist groups. I am sure that there may well have been others 'round and about' who did not succeed in finding a niche and have consequently moved on. Had they found it, and been helped to find it by the insiders, they might still be with us today.

To return to the original point of this letter, I think it may well be true that *FREEDOM* at this particular stage in its life is in need of a blood transfusion. I do not know whether the new blood exists. I hope, however, that S.F., in true anarchist fashion, will set about gathering round himself the half-dozen or so 'responsible' people capable of running the paper for a few months. Since the editors have assured him that the stable door is ever open and that they are panting for the green pastures, we may assume that the harness is theirs for the asking, provided agreement can be reached on a definition of 'responsible'. It may be that the institutionalisation of a three months' holiday for tired anarchist editors every three years is the answer to one of *FREEDOM*'s perennial problems.

GEOFFREY ØSTERGAARD.

London, June 18.

P.S.—I am not a candidate for high office.

A Suggestion for S.F.

I HAVE read with interest the correspondence columns of *FREEDOM* over the last few weeks, and am glad to note that the letter from S.F. has at least produced reactions from readers as well as the editors. This is a sign, however slight, that there are readers of *FREEDOM*

object will be achieved. This should... be interpreted as... an extra shoulder temporarily lent to lift a heavy load. Perhaps one of the present Editors would assist in a technical advisory capacity...."

There is of course nothing specifically

the same time give any advice or criticism where possible.

Thus what might be termed a gradualist approach to the problem could be made. S.F. and his co-operators would produce as much suitable material as

Pilg

I have recently leaflet, sent to me entitled "Our H which describes a Europe, similar March, though on The purpose is to the war in Algeria

The ideal of b world" is as old a with modern mea would have though be stronger that it In fact, however, bringing people t given them a bet savagely with each

"Why not then back sanity to this by choosing a pat and DISPOSSE through compassi ... WHAT CAN DO?"

Not all the st this leaflet would approval. Writing statesmen is a me have had little su test must be ba action to influence against a war wil but a strike on a sufficiently well o

8,000 postcards death-sentence on claimed to have President, which the sentence is such time as the retried". Meanw bably die in pris she has received, that something ha

Nor will anarc in appeal to the United Nations is the control of th doubt the ruler would like noth control of Algeria Sahara. If the U take over in Al would mean, the imperialism in Af French imperialism of Algeria themse the cessation of h cause.

There is much r final suggestion fo leaflet. "Join the personifying the d peaceful settlerme ences. The aim o bring the message man in the street, sons involved wit raise funds for th sion, and to show denial of HUMA

This seems a r least. Statesmen of heart (as states life they are oft could not function of the people di support them.

management. I dislike the busy-body politics of the *Spectator* more than I dislike the spinsterish whimpers of the *New Statesman* but I have to admit that the *Spectator* has got something which the *N.S.* hasn't: it's well and truly alive. The *N.S.* had a halfhearted face-lift recently but I have little doubt that it won't really begin to sparkle again until dear old Kingsley Martin is pensioned off and a new editor collects together another set of boys.

Many organisations, recognising the general problem, have institutionalised means of solving it to some extent. They introduce compulsory retiring ages or procedures whereby elected officers are required to stand down for a period before seeking re-election. These means do not commend themselves very much to anarchists: they savour too much of bureaucracy. Anarchist organisations also often suffer from the fact that work in them offers for most people very little reward, either material or psychic in nature. There is, therefore, rarely a surplus of talent pressing its take-over bid as there is in organisations offering high monetary or prestige rewards.

Of course, rarely maintains the same membership over any lengthy period of time: even anarchists are mortal! Original members drop out for one reason or another—the unanimity principle no doubt sometimes contributing to intra-group tensions. New members are brought in but only by the oligarchic method of co-option. Doubtless some or most of these new recruits 'choose themselves' in the sense that their outside activities have made them the most likely candidates. But there is, of course, no guarantee that this procedure will result in the best available recruits being obtained.

Oligarchy is to be commended in certain circumstances but it suffers from a number of inherent defects. Anarchist oligarchy is no exception. One of these defects is that it tends to generate a feeling of apathy on the part of the outsiders. The division between 'we' and 'they' begins to manifest itself very rapidly. This division cannot be bridged by name-calling between the parties. It is no use the outsiders muttering about the authoritarian tendencies of the insiders and it is no use the insiders mut-

ing, and been helped to find it by the insiders, they might still be with us today.

To return to the original point of this letter, I think it may well be true that FREEDOM at this particular stage in its life is in need of a blood transfusion. I do not know whether the new blood exists. I hope, however, that S.F., in true anarchist fashion, will set about gathering round himself the half-dozen or so 'responsible' people capable of running the paper for a few months. Since the editors have assured him that the stable door is ever open and that they are panting for the green pastures, we may assume that the harness is theirs for the asking, provided agreement can be reached on a definition of 'responsible'. It may be that the institutionalisation of a three months' holiday for tired anarchist editors every three years is the answer to one of FREEDOM's perennial problems.

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD.

London, June 18.

P.S.—I am not a candidate for high office.

A Suggestion for S.F.

I HAVE read with interest the correspondence columns of FREEDOM over the last few weeks, and am glad to note that the letter from S.F. has at least produced reactions from readers as well as the editors. This is a sign, however slight, that there are readers of FREEDOM who are sufficiently interested to put pen to paper. Whether they are "for" or "against" is not the essential point.

If I may circumnavigate most of the arguments which have been put forward in the correspondence (in the main they are personal expressions of opinion), and return to the suggestion put forward in S.F.'s original letter; he wrote:

"Now it is my suggestion that these honoured ladies and gentlemen (the editors) should be retired for a few months . . . (and) should invite a dozen people in London whom they feel are responsible enough to run a paper for a few months, not all of the dozen need to be active participants, but if half of this number agree to assist, then the

object will be achieved. This should . . . be interpreted as . . . an extra shoulder temporarily lent to lift a heavy load. Perhaps one of the present Editors would assist in a technical advisory capacity. . . ."

There is of course nothing specifically wrong with this idea—except that it might not work. I therefore have an alternative suggestion, based entirely on S.F.'s but modified, so that if all does not go well there would be no last minute calamity of any kind.

1. S.F. should be the one to invite a dozen people in London whom he feels are responsible and inclined to help.

2. He should invite them to write articles (on current news as well as "theoretical" material) which they could submit to him.

3. He could edit the articles and then discuss the situation *vis-à-vis* FREEDOM with an Editor (or Editors) who would be glad to have his contributions and at

the same time give any advice or criticism where possible.

Thus what might be termed a gradualist approach to the problem could be made. S.F. and his co-operators would produce as much suitable material as they could, and the present Editors the rest. (For it would be annoying to the readers if there were blank spaces in the paper). The more S.F. produced, the smaller the number of articles which would be "barely readable" (to quote S.F.).

The regular contributors would have a rest from the task of writing so much material themselves, S.F. and friends would gain experience and skill over a period, FREEDOM would benefit from additional (fresh) writers, and the readers would benefit all round.

Perhaps S.F. would care to contact me first—I for one look forward to having some of the "heavy load" lifted from my shoulders.

H.F.W.

. . . and an answer from him

PITY indeed that Boxer and Clover should have misinterpreted the spirit of my letter. So far as my agricultural knowledge goes Horses retired on double helpings of oats and sugar have done more than their share of work. One might even say that I nearly leaned over backwards to praise the efforts of the editors. My criticism of FREEDOM is in a sense, re-echoed by the Editors' reply which says "We have no doubt that there are many intelligent young men in our movement who could do what we are doing with a freshness of ideas which we old hacks have probably lost by now!" The fact that no one has yet come forward is not my fault or the editors, but that does not detract from my criticism of the paper as made.

Just for the record, my letter was provoked by a discussion between myself and three other comrades (regular readers of FREEDOM) on a rainy Sunday afternoon between mouthfuls of cheese and stale bread. I have read my letter diligently and nowhere do I indicate that I represent anyone's opinion but my own. Having been acquainted with the Anarchist movement for some years I would be the first to yell the usual clichés about someone else representing me. And as for the "stale steak", don't we all know that one man's poison is another man's indigestion.

As much as I like the Editors as people I will be "arrogant" enough to assume that none of them are vested with the infinite knowledge of "God", nor do they

even boast a Freud, so I cannot take them seriously when they tell me that my letter was a mere bit of exhibitionism laying my innermost motives bare, while at the same time finding me arrogant and a political dilettante, whatever the last adjective may mean. Surely the halos don't gleam any brighter on the editors' heads? I was also informed that I should only read the Yellow Press because I usually start reading an article with its title. It appears that I am bitter and my criticism is only that of "self-criticism".

Come, come now Editors, to have psycho-analysed me in half a column is indeed no mean feat and I may even consider going to regular sessions if the price is right. Conscience having pricked

President, which the sentence is such time as the retried". Meanwhably die in prison she has received. that something ha

Nor will anarch in appeal to the United Nations is the control of the doubt the rulers would like nothing control of Algeria Sahara. If the take over in A would mean, the imperialism in Af French imperialism of Algeria themselves the cessation of h cause.

There is much final suggestion fo leaflet. "Join the personifying the d peaceful settlement ences. The aim o bring the message man in the street, sons involved wit raise funds for tion, and to show denial of HUMA

This seems a least. Statesmen of heart (as states life they are oft could not function of the people d support them.

The real fault to man lies not w a tiny minority, b in early times ga bility for their o priests, and who sired to have it they have revolt things have becom

The key to the ing of people's mi they will increas ianism and exploi to overcome the has become ingrai is to be done is th

Vinoba Bhav voluntary surrende owners of India, ants who were po in this leaflet, as violent action, quickly and on a

somewhat the Edi coated pill and sa you mean well . . well mean well bothered to writ discuss some of tioned in my lett find out why I n place. Who can r that move one to and one things obvious is only l is mostly your g as mine. But life knowledge for so been achieved, society we will kn

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

tering about the lack of responsibility of the outsiders. The tension between the two sets of people is inherent in this type of organisation.

The matter is further complicated by anarchist ideology with its anti-authoritarian bias and its assumption that individual spontaneity exists and is highly commendable. Spontaneity undoubtedly exists, especially among anarchists, but I am not sure that it can be relied upon to produce the desired results in a tiny movement such as ours. As an outsider who has been around and about the movement for over ten years, I know that plenty of scope exists for people willing to do their bit. I believe that, in the last few years especially, I have spontaneously contributed a bit. Rather more has been contributed because I have been prompted by the editors. Looking back I feel that I might have contributed even more if some means existed, other than sporadic editorial appeals, to prompt my spontaneous instincts. I was around and about the movement for some years before, in some form or another, I found a niche as an occasional contributor to *FREEDOM* and lecturer at anarchist groups. I am sure that there may well have been others 'round and about' who did not succeed in finding a niche and have consequently moved on. Had they found it, and been helped to find it by the insiders, they might still be with us today.

To return to the original point of this letter, I think it may well be true that *FREEDOM* at this particular stage in its life is in need of a blood transfusion. I do not know whether the new blood exists. I hope, however, that S.F., in true anarchist fashion, will set about gathering round himself the half-dozen or so 'responsible' people capable of running the paper for a few months. Since the editors have assured him that the stable door is ever open and that they are panting for the green pastures, we may assume that the harness is theirs for the asking, provided agreement can be reached on a definition of 'responsible'. It may be that the institutionalisation of a three months' holiday for tired anarchist editors every three years is the answer to one of *FREEDOM*'s perennial problems.

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD.

London, June 18.

P.S.—I am not a candidate for high office.

Pilgrimage of Peace

I have recently received a typewritten leaflet, sent to me by a friend in France, entitled "Our Home is the World", which describes a projected march across Europe, similar to the Aldermaston March, though on a much larger scale. The purpose is to demonstrate against the war in Algeria.

The ideal of being a "citizen of the world" is as old as civilisation. To-day, with modern means of transport, one would have thought that this ideal would be stronger that it has ever been before. In fact, however, it appears that by bringing people together one has only given them a better chance to quarrel savagely with each other.

"Why not then an attempt to bring back sanity to this violence-ridden world by choosing a path of NON-VIOLENCE and DISPOSSESSION voluntarily through compassion and understanding? . . . WHAT CAN WE INDIVIDUALLY DO?"

Not all the suggestions included in this leaflet would meet with anarchist approval. Writing letters of protest to statesmen is a method which appears to have had little success in the past. Protest must be backed up by effective action to influence statesmen. A protest against a war will not have much effect, but a strike on a sufficiently large scale, sufficiently well organised, could do so.

8,000 postcards of protest against the death-sentence on Djamira Bouhired are claimed to have influenced the French President, which is all to the good, but the sentence is only "suspended until such time as the case was thoroughly retried". Meanwhile the girl will probably die in prison from the treatment she has received. It is good of course that something has been gained.

Nor will anarchists have much faith in appeal to the United Nations. The United Nations is an organisation under the control of the United States. No doubt the rulers of the United States would like nothing better than to take control of Algeria. There is oil in the Sahara. If the United Nations' forces take over in Algeria that is what it would mean, the forwarding of American imperialism in Africa at the expense of French imperialism. However, the people of Algeria themselves would benefit from the cessation of hostilities, whatever the cause.

There is much more to be said for the final suggestion for action made in this leaflet. "Join the 'pilgrimage for peace', personifying the desire of the people for peaceful settlements of political differences. The aim of this pilgrimage is to bring the message of non-violence to the man in the street, as well as to the persons involved with the government; to raise funds for the victims of suppression, and to show our protest against the denial of HUMAN RIGHTS."

This seems a more direct appeal at least. Statesmen are ruthless and hard of heart (as statesmen that is, in private life they are often amiable), but they could not function at all if the majority of the people did not enthusiastically support them.

There must therefore be some way of overcoming apathy and fear, which humanity has not yet really discovered.

"The Pilgrimage is scheduled to begin from Austria by July, via Yugoslavia (if permitted), Italy, Switzerland, to finish in France or in Algeria.

Another branch might begin from Scandinavia through Holland, Germany, Belgium, to France. It is desirable that on the same day token pilgrimages begin from as many towns as can be organised, each group going up to the next town or village, to meet and send resolutions to the French Government, urging a cease-fire. People may join in it for a short time, such as from a few hours a day to a whole week, or they can join for the whole route, which will take roughly three months to cover, mainly on foot . . . Gradually the pilgrimage may become a walking seminar for better understanding, by breaking down barriers in our own minds."

This who may wish to join the pilgrimage are asked to write to:

PEACE PILGRIM,
c/o MRS. BACON,
Merau Gasse 26,
Graz,
Germany.

A.W.U.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB.
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

JUNE 29.—Tony Gibson *on*
PARANOIA AS A SOCIAL FORCE

July 6.—Arthur W. Uloth *on*
MAN AGAINST SOCIETY

JULY 13.—Donovan Pedelty *on*
ANARCHISM & DEMOCRACY
Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP 1958 SUMMER SCHOOL

August 2nd—4th.

Subject: "WAR AND PEACE"
Speakers to be announced

Bookings are requested as soon as possible. Write: JOAN SCULTHORPE, c/o Freedom Press.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings

on for S.F.

ed. This should . . .
an extra shoulder
to lift a heavy load.
present Editors would
ical advisory capa-

the same time give any advice or criticism where possible.

Thus what might be termed a gradualist approach to the problem could be made. S.F. and his co-operators would produce as much suitable material as

...the same mem-
...thy period of time:
...mortal! Original
...for one reason or
...mity principle no
...contributing to intra-
...New members are
...ly by the oligarchic
...on. Doubtless some
...new recruits 'choose
...sense that their out-
...made them the most
...But there is, of course,
...this procedure will
...available recruits being
...be commended in cer-
...but it suffers from a
...at defects. Anarchist
...ception. One of these
...to generate a feel-
...the part of the out-
...on between 'we' and
...manifest itself very
...ion cannot be bridged
...tween the parties. It
...iders muttering about
...tendencies of the in-
...use the insiders mut-

it, and been helped to find it by the
insiders, they might still be with us to-
day.
To return to the original point of this
letter, I think it may well be true that
FREEDOM at this particular stage in its
life is in need of a blood transfusion.
I do not know whether the new blood
exists. I hope, however, that S.F., in
true anarchist fashion, will set about
gathering round himself the half-dozen
or so 'responsible' people capable of
running the paper for a few months.
Since the editors have assured him that
the stable door is ever open and that
they are panting for the green pastures,
we may assume that the harness is theirs
for the asking, provided agreement can
be reached on a definition of 'respon-
sible'. It may be that the institutional-
isation of a three months' holiday for
tired anarchist editors every three years
is the answer to one of FREEDOM's per-
ennial problems.
GEOFFREY ØSTERGAARD.
London, June 18.
P.S.—I am not a candidate for high
office.

on for S.F.

ved. This should ...
...an extra shoulder
...to lift a heavy load.
...present Editors would
...ical advisory capa-
...be nothing specifically
...idea—except that it
...I therefore have an
...on, based entirely on
...so that if all does
...would be no last
...any kind.
...be the one to invite a
...ndon whom he feels
...inclined to help.
...invite them to write
...at news as well as
...ial) which they could
...the articles and then
...on vis-à-vis FREEDOM
...Editors) who would
...contributions and at

the same time give any advice or critic-
ism where possible.
Thus what might be termed a gradual-
ist approach to the problem could be
made. S.F. and his co-operators would
produce as much suitable material as
they could, and the present Editors the
rest. (For it would be annoying to the
readers if there were blank spaces in the
paper). The more S.F. produced, the
smaller the number of articles which
would be "barely readable" (to quote
S.F.).
The regular contributors would have
a rest from the task of writing so much
material themselves, S.F. and friends
would gain experience and skill over a
period, FREEDOM would benefit from ad-
ditional (fresh) writers, and the readers
would benefit all round.
Perhaps S.F. would care to contact me
first—I for one look forward to having
some of the "heavy load" lifted from
my shoulders.
H.F.W.

answer from him

rd, my letter was pro-
...ssion between myself
...rades (regular read-
...a rainy Sunday after-
...thfuls of cheese and
...e read my letter dili-
...do I indicate that I
...opinion but my own.
...nted with the Anar-
...some years I would
...the usual clichés about
...sents me. And as
...", don't we all know
...son is another man's

even boast a Freud, so I cannot take
them seriously when they tell me that
my letter was a mere bit of exhibitionism
laying my innermost motives bare, while
at the same time finding me arrogant and
a political dilettante, whatever the last
adjective may mean. Surely the halos
don't gleam any brighter on the editors'
heads? I was also informed that I
should only read the Yellow Press be-
cause I usually start reading an article
with its title. It appears that I am bitter
and my criticism is only that of "self-
criticism".
Come, come now Editors, to have
psycho-analysed me in half a column is
indeed no mean feat and I may even con-
sider going to regular sessions if the
price is right. Conscience having pricked

claimed to have influenced the French
President, which is all to the good, but
the sentence is only "suspended until
such time as the case was thoroughly
retried". Meanwhile the girl will prob-
ably die in prison from the treatment
she has received. It is good of course
that something has been gained.
Nor will anarchists have much faith
in appeal to the United Nations. The
United Nations is an organisation under
the control of the United States. No
doubt the rulers of the United States
would like nothing better than to take
control of Algeria. There is oil in the
Sahara. If the United Nations' forces
take over in Algeria that is what it
would mean, the forwarding of American
imperialism in Africa at the expense of
French imperialism. However, the people
of Algeria themselves would benefit from
the cessation of hostilities, whatever the
cause.
There is much more to be said for the
final suggestion for action made in this
leaflet. "Join the 'pilgrimage for peace',
personifying the desire of the people for
peaceful settlements of political differ-
ences. The aim of this pilgrimage is to
bring the message of non-violence to the
man in the street, as well as to the per-
sons involved with the government; to
raise funds for the victims of suppres-
sion, and to show our protest against the
denial of HUMAN RIGHTS."
This seems a more direct appeal at
least. Statesmen are ruthless and hard
of heart (as statesmen that is, in private
life they are often amiable), but they
could not function at all if the majority
of the people did not enthusiastically
support them.
The real fault for man's inhumanity
to man lies not with the rulers, who are
a tiny minority, but with the ruled, who
in early times gave away the responsi-
bility for their own lives to kings and
priests, and who have never really de-
sired to have it back again, although
they have revolted occasionally when
things have become a bit too tough.
The key to the future lies in the chang-
ing of people's minds and hearts, so that
they will increasingly reject authoritar-
ianism and exploitation. It is necessary
to overcome the authoritarianism which
has become ingrained in them. How this
is to be done is the problem.
Vinoba Bhave's campaign for the
voluntary surrender of land by the land-
owners of India, for the benefit of peas-
ants who were poor or landless, is cited
in this leaflet, as an example of non-
violent action, which has succeeded
quickly and on a large scale.
somewhat the Editors throw in the sugar-
coated pill and say "Dear S.F., we know
you mean well ...". Of course I bloody
well mean well or I would not have
bothered to write the letter. Why not
discuss some of the suggestions I men-
tioned in my letter, instead of trying to
find out why I make them in the first
place. Who can really know the motives
that move one to do or be the hundred
and one things one does or is. The
obvious is only half the truth the rest
is mostly your guess which is as good
as mine. But life has continued on half-
knowledge for so long, and much has
been achieved, perhaps, in our new
society we will know it all.
S.F.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB.
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

JUNE 29.—Tony Gibson on
PARANOIA AS A SOCIAL FORCE
July 6.—Arthur W. Uloth on
MAN AGAINST SOCIETY
JULY 13.—Donovan Pedelty on
ANARCHISM & DEMOCRACY
Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP 1958 SUMMER SCHOOL August 2nd—4th.

Subject: "WAR AND PEACE"
Speakers to be announced

Bookings are requested as soon as
possible. Write: JOAN SCULTHORPE, c/o
Freedom Press.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Trad Jazz at the Malatesta

Every Friday and Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Members(1/6) and their guests (2/-) only.
MALATESTA CLUB
32 Percy Street
Tottenham Court Road W1
Jazz Men welcome
Organised by IAC

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt)
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates :
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should
be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed
a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1. England
Tel. : Chancery 8364